

# General Senior Secondary Education Financing in Indonesia



Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership  
(ACDP)

# General Senior Secondary Education Financing in Indonesia

Published by:

Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP)  
Agency for Research and Developments (Balitbang), Ministry of Education and Culture  
Building E 19<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Jl. Jendral Sudirman, Senayan, Jakarta 10270  
Tel: +62-21-578-511000, Fax: +62-21-578-51101  
Website: [www.acdp-indonesia.org](http://www.acdp-indonesia.org)  
Secretariat Email: [secretariat@acdp-indonesia.org](mailto:secretariat@acdp-indonesia.org)

Printed in September 2013

The Government of Indonesia (represented by the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Ministry of Religious Affairs, and the Ministry of National Development Planning / *BAPPENAS*), the Government of Australia, through Australian Aid, the European Union (EU) and the Asian Development Bank (ADB) have established the Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership (ACDP). ACDP is a facility to promote policy dialogue and facilitate institutional and organizational reform to underpin policy implementation and to help reduce disparities in education performance. The facility is an integral part of the Education Sector Support Program (ESSP). EU's support to the ESSP also includes a sector budget support along with a Minimum Service Standards capacity development program. Australia's support is through Australia's Education Partnership with Indonesia. This report has been prepared with grant support provided by AusAID and the EU through ACDP.



The institutions responsible for producing this report were Cambridge Education, Indonesia in cooperation with the SMERU Research Institute.

The members of the study team who prepared this report were:

1. Edy Priyono, Researcher
2. Vita Febriany, Researcher

The views expressed in this publication are the sole responsibility of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Government of Indonesia, the Government of Australia, the European Union or the Asian Development Bank.

# **General Senior Secondary Education Financing in Indonesia**

# Table of Contents

<b>Abbreviations</b>	<b>iv</b>
<b>Executive Summary</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>1. Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Background	3
1.2 Scope and Focus	4
<b>2. Methodology</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Study Approaches	5
2.2 Primary Data Collection	5
2.3 Method of Analysis	7
2.4 Limitations	7
<b>3. Educational Service Costs</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Costs in Schools	8
3.2 Sources of Funds	10
3.3 Household Expenses	13
<b>4. Service Standards and Financing Implications</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1 Service Standards	18
4.2 Financing Implications	20
4.3 Responsibilities for Financing Senior Secondary Education	21
<b>5. Initiatives to Increase Senior Secondary School Participation</b>	<b>23</b>
5.1 Central Government Initiatives	23
5.2 Provincial Government Initiatives	24
5.3 District Government Initiatives	24
5.4 School Initiatives	25
<b>6. Policy Options for Expansion of Senior Secondary Education</b>	<b>26</b>
6.1 Provision of Infrastructure	27
6.2 Provision of Operational Funds for <i>SMA</i> s (the <i>BOS</i> Model)	27
6.3 Increasing Efficiency	28
6.4 Engaging with the Private Sector	30
6.5 Provision of Teaching and Learning Materials	31
6.6 Financial Assistance to Poor Students	31
6.7 Next Step: Financing Scenarios	33
<b>Appendix A. Study Research Methodology</b>	<b>34</b>
<b>Appendix B. School and Household Survey Instruments</b>	<b>37</b>
<b>Photo Credit</b>	<b>48</b>

## List of Tables

Table 2.1: Qualitative and quantitative approaches to the terms of reference	5
Table 2.2: Selection stages of the location and study respondents	6
Table 2.3: <i>Kabupaten</i> , Schools and Households Visited/Surveyed	6
Table 3.1: School Survey Results for Non-salary Operational Costs, per student per year	8
Table 3.2: Number and Percentage of Non- <i>PNS</i> Teachers in the Study	9
Table 3.3: Standard Annual Operational Costs for Non Personnel	10
Table 3.4: School Revenue for Non-salary Operational Costs* from Various Sources (%)	11
Table 3.5: Categories of Direct and Indirect Costs in the Present Study	13
Table 3.6: Direct and Indirect Costs Identified in the Household Survey	14
Table 3.7: The Proportion of High School Students Working	16
Table 3.8: Characteristics of work types (% students working)	16
Table 3.9: Distribution <i>SMA</i> Students from Grade 10 and <i>SMP</i> Graduates who did not continue their education based on Household income level (% Respondents)	17
Table 3.10: Reasons why <i>SMP</i> graduates have not continued to <i>SMA</i>	17
Table 4.1: First Draft of Minimum Service Standards for <i>SMA</i> and a Comparison with those for <i>SMP</i> and <i>MT</i>	18
Table 4.2: Achievements in the First Draft of Minimum Service Standards for <i>SMAs</i> in 9 Study Schools*	19
Table 4.3: Minimum Service Standards Proposed for <i>SMA</i>	20
Table 6.1: Enrolments in <i>SMA</i> , <i>SMK</i> and <i>MA</i> 2003/04-2009/10	26
Table A.1: Selection stages of the location and study respondents	35
Table A.2: <i>Kabupaten</i> , Schools and Households Visited/Surveyed	36

## List of Figures

Figure 3.1: Current Sources of Finance and their Uses	11
Figure 3.2: Median of Percentage of School Non-Salary Operational Cost from Various Sources	12
Figure 3.3: Contribution (%) by Type of Expense to Total Expenditure on Education	14
Figure 3.4: The cost considered most burdensome by households	15
Figure 4.1: Simplifying the sources of funding for State <i>SMAs</i>	18

# Abbreviations

ACDP	Education Sector Analytical and Capacity Development Partnership
APK	<i>Angka Partisipasi Kasar</i> (Gross Enrolment Rate see GER)
APM	<i>Angka Partisipasi Murni</i> (Net Enrolment Rate see NER)
ATS	<i>Alat Tulis Sekolah</i> (stationary)
BAHP	<i>Bahan dan Alat Habis Pakai</i> (Consumable supplies)
BAPPENAS	<i>Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional</i> (National Planning Agency)
BKMM	<i>Beasiswa Khusus Murid Miskin</i> (scholarship for poor student)
BOMM	<i>Bantuan Operasional Manajemen Mutu</i> (Operational Assistance for Quality Management)
BOS	<i>Bantuan Operasi Sekolah</i> (School Operating Grants)
BPKB	<i>Buku Pemilik Kendaraan Bermotor</i> (vehicle ownership book)
BPS	<i>Badan Pusat Statistik</i> (Central Bureau of Statistics)
CCT	Conditional Cash Transfer (performance linked payment mechanism)
CPDP	Continuous Professional Development Programme
D4	Diploma 4
DBE1	Decentralized Basic Education Project (USAID) 2005-2011
ESC	Education Service Contracting Program
EVS	Education Voucher Scheme
FAS	Foundation Assisted Schools
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
GER	Gross Enrolment Rate (see APK)
ICL	Income Contingent Loans
ICT	Information, Communication, and Technology
ILA	Individual Learning Accounts
IPA	<i>Ilmu Pengetahuan Alam</i> (natural science)
IPS	<i>Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial</i> (social science)
Kabupaten	District (Administrative entity within a Province)
Kota	City/Town (Administrative entity within a Province)
KTSP	<i>Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan</i> (School-Based Curriculum)
MA	<i>Madrasah Aliyah</i> (Islamic Senior Secondary School)
MBS	<i>Manajemen Berbasis Sekolah</i> (School-Based Management)
MDG	Millennium development Goals
MI	<i>Madrasah Ibtidaiyah</i>
MoEC	Ministry of Education and Culture ( <i>Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan</i> )
MORA	Ministry of Religious Affairs ( <i>Departemen Agama</i> )
MTs	<i>Madrasah Tsanawiyah</i> (Islamic Junior Secondary School)
MSS	Minimum Service Standards
NER	Net Enrolment Rate (see APM)
NSE	National Standard/s for Education
NTT	Nusa Tenggara Timur

OSIS	<i>Organisasi Siswa Intra Sekolah</i> (Students Organization)
PACES	<i>Programa de Ampliación de Cobertura de la Educación Secundaria</i> (program provided poor children with vouchers that covered half the cost of private secondary school in Colombia)
PEF	Punjab Education Foundation
Pemda	<i>Pemerintah Daerah</i> (Regional Government)
Permendiknas	<i>Peraturan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional</i> (National Ministry of Education Regulation)
PNS	<i>Pegawai negeri Sipil</i> (civil servants)
PPP	Public Private Partnership
RAPBS	<i>Rencana Anggaran Penerimaan dan Belajar Sekolah</i> (School Budget Plan)
<i>Renstra</i>	<i>Rencana Strategis</i> (Strategic Plan)
Rombel	<i>Rombongan Belajar</i> (Study Groups)
RPP	<i>Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran</i> (Teacher Teaching Plans)
RSBI	<i>Rintisan Sekolah Berstandar International</i> (International Standard School)
S1	<i>Strata 1</i> (Bachelor Degree)
S2	<i>Strata 2</i> (Master Degree)
SD	<i>Sekolah Dasar</i> (Primary School)
SGP	Scholarships and Grants Program
SKM	<i>Surat Keterangan Miskin</i> (Statement of Poverty)
SLTA	<i>Sekolah Lanjutan Tingkat Atas</i> (general senior secondary school, vocational SSS and Islamic SSS)
SMA	<i>Sekolah Menengah Atas</i> (Senior Secondary School)
SMAN	<i>Sekolah Menengah Atas Negeri</i> (Public Senior Secondary School)
SMAS	<i>Sekolah Menengah Atas Swasta</i> (Private Senior Secondary School)
SMERU	<i>Lembaga Penelitian</i> (Research Institute)
SMK	<i>Sekolah Menengah Kerjuran</i> (Vocational Senior Secondary School)
SMP	<i>Sekolah Menengah Pertama</i> (Junior Secondary School)
SPN	<i>Satndar Pendidikan Nasional</i> (National Education Standard)
SU	<i>Sekolah Unggulan</i> (Seeded School)
SPM	<i>Standar Pelayanan Minimal</i> (Minimum Services Standards)
Swasta	Private/non-State ( <i>SMAS</i> is a Private <i>SMA</i> )
Take-home	Survey form which students “take home”, complete and return to school
USB	<i>Unit Sekolah Baru</i> (new school unit)





# Executive Summary

This report examines the policy options and financial implications of the expansion of senior secondary education in Indonesia. The government wishes to increase the gross enrolment rate from 70% to 85% by 2014 and aims for universal 12-year education by 2019.

The approach adopted has been to: analyse current costs and funding arrangements through fieldwork and a review of secondary sources; consider the financing implications of achieving a set of minimum standards; review the current government funding provision; and examine a range of policy options for the expansion of senior secondary enrolments.

The current funding of government senior secondary education is complex and varies throughout the country. It involves different levels of government providing financial support for infrastructure, salaries and operational costs. A common feature of the senior secondary sub-sector is its dependence on parental contributions. This has implications for school quality and for equity. The government's policy of designating some schools as 'international standard secondary schools' (*RSBI*) has inadvertently adversely affected equity.

The study found considerable variation in the levels of cost and the amounts of available revenue among state senior secondary schools (*SMA*), with the *RSBI* being far better resourced than the rest. Salaries of government service teachers (*PNS*) are the responsibility of government. Those of teachers without *PNS* status, who are numerous in some schools, have to be paid for from other sources and almost invariably these costs fall on parents. The burden on parents comes in various forms. There are direct charges for fees and registration books and uniforms and there are indirect costs of transport and meals. There are also high opportunity costs of sending children to senior secondary school to set against the perceived returns of this level of schooling.

As there are no agreed minimum service standards for *SMA*, the study constructed a set of standards based on those adopted for primary and junior secondary schools, adapted them in the light of discussions in the field and assessed sample schools against these standards. There were a number of areas in which schools fell short of the standards, particularly in the provision of textbooks and the certification of teachers. The study then considered the financial implications for schools of meeting them.

In seeking a more rational funding arrangement for senior secondary education, a number of important policy issues were raised. These concern the relative responsibilities of different levels of government for senior secondary education and the nature and magnitude of parental contributions. These issues need to be addressed in the knowledge that Government finances are limited and that decisions need to be made on the "desired" level of user charges, because the private returns to this level of education are high. Such decisions will have implications for social policy and the government's stated intention of extending access to all. It also raises questions about the efficacy of efforts to reduce the cost burden for poor families through selective government subsidies and other pro-poor schemes.

The report outlines the efforts the various levels of government are making to support an expansion of senior secondary education. The central government is supporting investment in school building and subsidising operational costs through *BOMM* (grant assistance for quality and management) and an extension of per-capita school grants (*BOS*). It also promotes participation of poor students through scholarships (*BKMM*). District governments have introduced schemes to provide revenue to schools and reduce the burden of school fees. Some are also increasing enrolments through innovative school structures, such as the filial schools in Grobogan and Karawang.

Various policy options are explored for increasing participation in senior secondary schools and examples from international experience are provided. These options cover the need for greater supply of places, both for the currently projected rise in the number of children graduating from junior secondary schools and for an extra 260,000 children who will need to be enrolled if the 85% target is to be reached in the next two years. Reliance on school building to meet the challenge will not be sufficient, because of the very high costs involved and the limited time available. Other approaches are examined. These include structural innovations, such as the grouping of schools to reap economies of scale and overcome geographical obstacles. The *filial schools* model is one such example, but there are also other models in operation in other countries. These include the use of distance learning and the application of new technology.

Increased efficiency, particularly in the major cost item, the use of teachers, would be a source of major savings which would free up resources for expansion. In order to reap efficiency gains the government needs to look critically at student-teacher ratios, which are very low, and teachers' time on task. Teacher absenteeism and the practice of having several jobs mean that unit costs are much higher than they need to be.

A further option for managing the expansion of enrolments lies in promoting closer partnerships with the private sector. There are precedents for this in Indonesia and examples of successful collaboration in the international experience. Possible interventions include government financial support and the provision of teachers to private schools.

While the focus of attention is on increasing access, it is equally important to consider ways in which the quality and relevance of senior secondary education can be enhanced. Perceptions of quality and relevance are in any case powerful determinants of demand.

Options for increasing demand, particularly among lower income groups, are explored. This is a process that will become harder as the enrolment rate rises and the target population includes increasingly poor and remote populations. Interventions include various forms of cash transfers and scholarships and there are international models from which valuable lessons can be learned. Critical to the success of such schemes is the accuracy of the targeting.

The next steps beyond this report will be to construct financial scenarios, in order to model the various options, their consequences and their costs. Simulation models are available that will list the variables and show the effects of changing the inputs. No one policy or intervention will be sufficient to reach the objective of increased access. The preferred mix of policies and programmes will be determined by political and macro-economic factors beyond the scope of this exercise. However, the proposed financial models will help to inform decision making by demonstrating the likely effects of various policy measures.

# 1. Introduction

## 1.1 Background

Having achieved significant increases in access to primary and junior high school education, the Government of Indonesia's next priority is to increase access to Senior Secondary School education on an equitable basis.<sup>1</sup> The Government's Medium Term Plan (*Renstra* 2010-2014) has set a gross enrolment rate target of 85 per cent, and in 2010 the Government initiated the progressive introduction of compulsory 12-year education for all Indonesian children by 2019.

The current gross enrolment rate (GER) in senior secondary education is less than 70%.<sup>2</sup> There are significant geographical differences in enrolment, with several provinces having participation rates of less than 55%. Gaps also exist between districts (*Kabupaten/Kota*) within provinces. Inequalities in resource allocation have resulted in a wide gap, both in access to general Senior Secondary Schools (*SMA*) and in the quality of these schools. The financing of senior secondary education in Indonesia is fragmented, with different sources of funds, not only between state and private schools but also between state schools.

For the majority of senior secondary schools around 80% of all operational fund goes to pay teachers' salaries. This leaves limited funds for improvements in the quality of teaching and learning. This situation is exacerbated by the low financial capacity of regional governments and the low priority given to education in a number of *Kabupaten/Kota*. As a result, many state schools depend to a very large extent on contributions by parents.

This high level of dependence on parental contributions means that schools vary greatly because of the economic capacity of the families they serve. This is reflected in differences in the quality of teaching and learning. For poor families, the private costs of senior secondary education are major constraints on access. The opportunity cost of senior secondary education is greater than at the primary or the junior high school levels, because the income that is lost because the child continues to attend school is greater.<sup>3</sup> There is also a significant supply side constraint on access to senior secondary schools. In many poor and/or remote areas, no local school is available. In such situations, the cost of education that parents must bear is greater because of the high cost of transport to reach the nearest school or the expense incurred if a child leaves home to live near a school. The limited number of schools in part explains the low participation rates in remote areas.

1 Senior Secondary School education includes *SMA* (Senior Secondary School), *SMK* (Senior Vocational School) and *MA* (Madrasah Aliyah religious schools). *SMA* and *SMK* are under the coordination of the Ministry of Education and Culture, while *MA* are under the coordination of the Ministry of Religious Affairs.

2 BPS Education Indicators 1994-2010 publication reports senior secondary GER in 2010 as 62.5%, with three Provinces below 55% and six more less than 60% GER. A comprehensive MoEC analysis of 2009/10 data including *SMA/SMK/MA* and Packet C reported national GER as 69.5%, with 4 Provinces below 60% and 9 between 60- 65%.

3 In official statistics the working age is 15 and over, which means that, unlike those in primary and junior high school, students in Senior Secondary School (16-18 years) are included in the working age category.

Government efforts to improve the quality of education may have had the unintended consequence of reducing equity. Over the past three years, a number of government senior secondary schools (*SMA*) have become *Rintisan Sekolah Bertaraf Internasional* (International Standard Schools - *RSBI*). There are also ordinary *SMA* (non-*RSBI*) that receive large parental contributions to their funds, which places these schools above the average national level. These schools are known as *Sekolah Unggulan*. At the present time there are 363 *SMA* in the *RSBI* category and 132 *SMA*, which are *Sekolah Unggulan*. In addition to receiving an allocation of government funds greater than those given to ordinary schools, these schools have greater access to contributions of funds from parents.

The Government has encouraged *RSBI* schools to provide opportunities from children from poor families to access good quality education through scholarships. However, in practice, children from poor families encounter obstacles before they can enter an *RSBI*. As a result, only a few are able to enjoy a reduction in expenses through the scholarship mechanism. Much of the large subsidy given to the *RSBI* schools and *Sekolah Unggulan* would appear to benefit children from non-poor families.

## 1.2 Scope and Focus

The purpose of this assignment has been to examine the current situation and to provide options for the expansion of senior secondary education to 85% GER by 2015 and near universal coverage by 2019. The Terms of reference are set out in Appendix A. It looks for lessons that can be learned from the experience of Indonesia in increasing access to primary and junior secondary schooling and at international evidence of what works in contexts that are sufficiently analogous to provide useful learning.

The Study is focused on the following:

- **The structure of finances for different types of state *SMA*** (*RSBI* and non-*RSBI*), including specific components of expenditure, namely, **direct costs** (costs to support teaching-learning activities) and **indirect costs** (costs that have to be paid by students and/or their parents to register at the school and to take part in learning activities).
- **Various sources of finance for different types of *SMA***, including how the financial burden is distributed among the government, parents, and the general community (and other sources).
- **Development of simple service standards** that are necessary for conducting the teaching-learning process, based on National Education Standards (*SPN*), with consideration of their funding implications. This analysis has been done through consultations with a wide variety of relevant parties: teachers; school principals; school supervisors; district education officials; and relevant units in the Ministry of Education and Culture. .
- **Development of strategic options** for nationwide expansion that take into account adequacy, efficiency and equity

The study suggests that a key next step could be the development of senior secondary education financing scenarios through the simulation of the various costed policy options.

## 2. Methodology

### 2.1 Study Approaches

The study was carried out using methods that combine analysis of senior secondary school service suppliers (in this case the Government and the schools), as well as a demand-side analysis focusing on households with school-aged children. The study combined primary data analysis from tailor-made research instruments with secondary data analysis on participation rates, *SMA*-level school services data and poverty data, available from various central and regional agencies. The primary research component employed a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. The qualitative methods involved in-depth interviews and focus group discussions (FGD), whereas the quantitative methods consisted of a household survey using a structured questionnaire.

**Table 2.1: Qualitative and quantitative approaches to the terms of reference**

Method	Respondent/Data Reviewed
Review of documents	Regional Government education expenditure (in particular the budget allocation for <i>SMA</i> ) School profile (number of students, teachers, facilities, etc) School budget (including a copy of <i>RAPBS</i> – the school's budget) Attainment of tentative Service Standard in every school
Key informant interview	Provincial Education Office <i>Kabupaten</i> Education Office School Principal
Take-home survey	Students of grades 10, 11, 12
Visit to home	2010/2011 <i>SMP</i> graduates who did not continue to <i>SMA</i>
Focus Group Discussion (FGD)	Education Offices, teachers, principals and school superintendents

### 2.2 Primary Data Collection

The prime purpose of the research component of the study was to establish empirical evidence on the actual costs of senior secondary schooling.

Data collection in the Study was conducted at several levels: Province and *Kabupaten*; high schools; and households. An explanation of the data collection process at each level is outlined in Appendix B. The locations for the research were chosen through various stages. Provinces were chosen that had higher than average poverty rates (above 13.7%). After selecting the provinces, the selection of the *Kabupaten* was done using criteria of poverty and Gross Enrolment Rates (GER).

Table 2.2: Selection stages of the location and study respondents

Selection stage	Reason / Selection criteria
Province	Above the average national poverty rate (>13.7%)
<i>Kabupaten</i>	Poverty and Gross Enrolment Rates (GER)
School	In each <i>Kabupaten</i> two schools were selected. The first school was <i>RSBI</i> (if one existed). The second school had average quality, was located in the <i>Kabupaten</i> centre but not too far from the centre, and on advice from the Education Office.
Student/ Household	1. For the take home survey: Students selected randomly from grades 10, 11 and 12 with proportional amounts of girls and boys and between the study majors of Science ( <i>IPA</i> ), Humanities ( <i>IPS</i> ) and Languages (few <i>SMA</i> offer this major). 2. For visiting the homes of <i>SMP</i> graduates who did not continue studying, the sample selection was based on information from the <i>SMP</i> and the “snow-balling” technique.

The field-work included eight *Kabupaten* in four provinces and in each *Kabupaten*, the team visited two to three schools, one of which was *SMA RSBI* (unless in the area there was no high school in the *RSBI* category). In total, the Study team collected information on 17 high schools, five of which were *SMA RSBI*. Table 2.3 below details the visits.

Table 2.3: *Kabupaten*, Schools and Households Visited/Surveyed

Province	<i>Kabupaten</i>	School	RSBI	Household/Student
<b>Test trials</b>				
DKI Jakarta	Kota Central Jakarta	SMAN 68	Yes	100 take home
Jawa Barat	<i>Kabupaten</i> Bogor	SMAN 1 Cibinong		Nil
<b>Field Study</b>				
<b>Jawa Tengah</b>	Purbalingga	SMAN 1 Purbalingga	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 1 Bukateja		100 take home 20 Household visits
	Grobogan	SMAN 1 Purwodadi	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 1 Toroh		100 take home 20 Household visits
<b>Lampung</b>	Lampung Tengah	SMAN 1 Kota Gajah	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 1 Gunung Singgih		100 take home
	Pesawaran	SMAN 1 Gedong Tataan	*	100 take home
		SMAN 2 Padang Cermin		100 take home
<b>Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT)</b>	Kota Kupang	SMAN 3 Kupang**	Yes	120 take home
	Timor Tengah Selatan (TTS)	SMAN 1 Molo Selatan		120 take home 20 Household visits
		SMAN 1 Soe		Not carried out #
	Sumba Timur	SMAN 1 Waingapu	*	60 take home 20 Household visits
		SMAN 1 Haharu		60 take home
<b>Jawa Barat</b>	Karawang	SMAN 1 Karawang	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 4 Karawang		Not carried out
		SMAN 1 Teluk Jambe		100 take home
		SMAS Korpri		100 take home

\* SMAN 1 Waingapu and SMAN 1 Gedong Tataan are “Model Schools” and have sought to become *RSBI* schools. \*\* SMAN 3 in Kota Kupang was included as the only *RSBI* school in NTT Province.

# No students in school on the day of the site visit (Saturday).

## 2.3 Method of Analysis

Estimated actual costs and revenues of schools were based on school budget documents (*RAPBS*). The study also sought information about additional funds that might be available to schools beyond those listed in the school budget, in order to obtain a complete picture of the overall school revenues and expenditures. Information needed to calculate the operational costs was collected through school surveys and backed up through interviews, so that profiles of the schools (including the number of students, teachers, classrooms, etc.) could be built up, and cross-referenced with school budget documents.

## 2.4 Limitations

This study was undertaken only in State *SMA*s, whereas senior secondary education includes State *SMA*, Private *SMA*, *SMK* (both State and Private) and *MA* (State and Private). The Study research team considered what occurs in Private *SMA*, *SMK* and *MA*, but the majority of the conclusions and recommendations are based on matters concerning State *SMA*.

The policy of regional autonomy, both directly and indirectly, has implications for this study. With decentralisation, management of senior secondary school education (and also primary level education) lies with local government (*Kabupaten/Kota*). In this situation, policy variations between regions are expected with implications for local in practices concerning the financing of education at the school level.

An analysis of primary data for this study was limited to a practicable number of field visits and a small sample of schools. The patterns and practices in the financing of education are therefore not exhaustive. For that reason, generalisations were made with caution, and should be understood with equal caution.

## 3. Educational Service Costs

### 3.1 Costs in Schools

This section considers aspects of the costs of education in senior secondary schools.

#### 3.1.1 School Survey Results

Using the approaches outlined in chapter 2, the study team calculated schools' non-salary operational expenses<sup>4</sup>. Results show that in the field there is no uniformity in the format of school budgets. Four different ways of classifying cost types in school budgets were identified and this makes analysis and comparisons between schools difficult. Some schools used the standard government budget classification. Others grouped costs in line with the categories in the National Education Standards. Yet others used activity-based classification. A fourth set of schools used their own esoteric formats that did not comply with any of the other models.

This lack of standardised ways of recording costs meant that researchers had to look at details of school expenditure one by one to filter out investment costs and staff salaries, so that non-salary operational cost components could be identified and their value calculated.<sup>5</sup> Using this approach, Table 3.1 below shows that for all State *SMA*s in this study, non-salary operational costs range from Rp 340,000 to Rp 4,595,000 per student per year, with a median of around Rp 1,099,000.

**Table 3.1: School Survey Results for Non-salary Operational Costs, per student per year**

Non-salary Operational Costs	<i>RSBI</i>	Non <i>RSBI</i>	<i>RSBI</i> +Non <i>RSBI</i>
Minimum	933,621	539,588	539,588
Median	3,234,935	928,256	1,099,062
Maximum	4,595,224	1,865,478	4,595,224

The table separates the status of schools (*RSBI* and non-*RSBI*). It can be seen that *RSBI* schools spend more non-salary operational funds than non-*RSBI* schools. The main reason is that the *RSBI* schools have access to wider and more varied sources of finance than those available to non-*RSBI* schools. On average *RSBI* schools receive three times more operational (non-salary) funds from District governments than non-*RSBI* school. In addition, monthly fees and a one-off 'entrance/registration' fees in *RSBI* schools are always greater than in non-*RSBI* schools. In Karawang where the District government implements a "free education" policy in public *SMA*s, *RSBI* schools are exempted and therefore have additional fee income from parents.

<sup>4</sup> Conceptually, the term "non-employee" differs a little from the term "non-salary". "Non-employee" excludes all components in payments for employees, whereas non-salary still accommodates expenditure for employees outside salary and official allowances.

<sup>5</sup> The payment of salaries for non-PNS teachers (those who do not have full civil services status) is often reported as an 'operational' cost rather than a salary cost.



### 3.1.2 Cost Classification

According to Government Regulation No 19 of 2005 concerning National Educational Standards, the costs for education fall into three categories - investment costs, operational costs and personal costs.

- Investment costs at school level are for the provision of infrastructure and facilities, the development of human resources, and fixed working capital.
- Operational costs are for salaries of teachers and other educational staff together with allowances attached to salaries, materials and equipment, and indirect costs in the form of electricity, water, telecommunications, maintenance of infrastructure and facilities, overtime payments, transportation, consumption, tax, insurance and the like.
- Personal costs are defined as expenses that must be paid by students (or their parents and guardians) in order to be able to take part in the learning process in a regular and continuous manner.

The size of investment expenditure varies greatly among schools. For non-*RSBI* schools included in this Study, the range was from Rp 20 million to Rp 350 million, while for *RSBI* schools the range was between Rp 750 million and Rp 1.2 billion (last school year). *RSBI* schools clearly receive the lion's share of investment funding from the government for the provision of physical facilities. At the same time, there are many other schools that receive little or no aid of this kind. The average expenditure for investment costs in *RSBI* schools is around three to four times greater than in non-*RSBI* schools.

In the case of operational costs, the greater part goes to expenditure on teachers' salaries. The salaries of teachers who are public servants are paid directly by Regional Governments (*Pemda*), while payments to teachers who are not public servants (non-*PNS*) depend on different policies that exist in each region. In some districts, salaries are paid the local government, but in many districts salaries of non-*PNS* teachers have to be financed from funds that come from parents.

Operational costs for teachers' salaries and those of education staff are difficult to categorise, because of the large variations in the number and proportion of *PNS* and non-*PNS* teachers in schools. Table 3.2 shows that the number of non-*PNS* teachers ranges from three (4%) to 25 persons (74%) in the sample schools. In general, relatively newly established schools have more non-*PNS* teachers, but the majority of them are in the process of becoming accredited. To illustrate this point, the largest percentage of non-*PNS* teachers was found in an *SMA* in Lampung, which is just five years old.

**Table 3.2: Number and Percentage of Non-*PNS* Teachers in the Study**

School	Total Number of Teachers	Number of Non- <i>PNS</i> Teachers	% Non <i>PNS</i> Teacher	Note
1. <i>SMA</i> A	58	12	20,69	<i>RSBI</i>
2. <i>SMA</i> B	48	15	31,25	<i>RSBI</i>
3. <i>SMA</i> C	95	16	16,84	<i>RSBI</i>
4. <i>SMA</i> D	79	3	3,80	<i>RSBI</i>
5. <i>SMA</i> E	65	7	10,77	<i>RSBI</i>
<b><i>RSBI</i> Average</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>10,6</b>	<b>15,54</b>	
6. <i>SMA</i> F	51	6	11,76	Non <i>RSBI</i>
7. <i>SMA</i> G	68	4	5,88	Non <i>RSBI</i>
8. <i>SMA</i> H	57	12	21,05	Non <i>RSBI</i>
9. <i>SMA</i> I	50	8	16,00	Non <i>RSBI</i>
10. <i>SMA</i> J	40	6	15,00	Non <i>RSBI</i>

School	Total Number of Teachers	Number of Non-PNS Teachers	% Non PNS Teacher	Note
11. SMA K	46	10	21,74	Non RSBI
12. SMA L	42	9	21,43	Non RSBI
13. SMA M	34	25	73,53	Non RSBI
14. SMA N	50	6	12,00	Non RSBI
15. SMA O	36	4	11,11	Non RSBI
16. SMA P	28	4	14,29	Non RSBI
<b>Non-RSBI Average</b>	<b>45,6</b>	<b>8,5</b>	<b>18,74</b>	
<b>Overall Average (RSBI+Non RSBI)</b>	<b>52,8</b>	<b>9,2</b>	<b>17,36</b>	

The government has attempted to stipulate the expected levels of non-salary-related operational costs. Regulation No. 69 of 2009 of the Minister for National Education sets the standard for non-salary related operational costs for all school levels (including SMA). Cost standards are calculated on the assumption that the number of study groups (*rombel*) is six and the number of students is 32 per study group, which means a total of 192 students. The results for SMAs can be seen in Table 3.3. For the Language and Sociology streams, the annual unit cost per student is Rp 960,000, while for the Science stream it is a little larger, that is, Rp 1,010,000 per year.

**Table 3.3: Standard Annual Operational Costs for Non Personnel**

School/Stream	Standard Costs (Rp 000)			% Minimum for ATS	% Minimum for BAHF
	Per School	Per Study Group	Per Student		
SMA/MA Language	184,320	30,720	960	10	10
SMA/MA Sociology	184,320	30,720	960	10	10
SMA/MA Science	193,920	32,320	1,010	10	10
SMA/MA Science	193,920	32,320	1,010	10	10

Source: Annex I Regulation No 69 Year 2009 of the Minister for Education

Regulation No. 69/2009 also deals with details of operational spending. According to this regulation, a minimum of 10% of the allocation may be used for the purchase of school stationery and consumables and equipment.


## 3.2 Sources of Funds

### 3.2.1 Current Situation

The funding of State SMAs is complicated. The payment of salaries of teachers who are public servants is a district government responsibility, while personal expenses are obviously the responsibility of parents. For other expenses (investments, salary and non-salary operations), there is considerable variation in sources of funding among schools.

Figure 3.1 gives a picture of sources of finance and their uses for state SMA schools.

Figure 3.1: Current Sources of Finance and their Uses



Parents are the main source of non-salary operational finance, with the assistance of the central and district governments and - in some cases - the provincial government. The financial role of parents is very important, particularly because parents also contribute to payment of the salaries of non-PNS teachers and investment costs (except in those areas such as *Kabupaten Karawang*, which has introduced a “free schooling” policy in State SMAs).

The significance of funds from parents was highlighted by survey results. Table 3.4 reveals that funds from parents provide more than three quarters of the funds needed for operational (non-salary) costs in State SMAs in both the *RSBI* and non-*RSBI* categories.

Table 3.4: School Revenue for Non-salary Operational Costs\* from Various Sources (%)


Source of Funds	RSBI	Non RSBI**	RSBI + Non RSBI**
<b>1. District government</b>			
1.1. Minimum	2.20	4.42	2.20
1.2. Median	4.87	5.54	5.24
1.3. Maximum	21.82	9.77	21.82
<b>2. Provincial government</b>			
2.1. Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00
2.2. Median	3.44	0.00	0.00
2.3. Maximum	9.49	1.06	9.49
<b>3. Central government</b>			
3.1. Minimum	5.19	4.50	4.50
3.2. Median	5.61	10.15	7.88
3.3. Maximum	35.45	38.56	38.56
<b>4. Parents</b>			
4.1. Minimum	50.19	57.72	50.19
4.2. Median	78.75	78.01	81.47
4.3. Maximum	84.93	87.83	87.83

Source of Funds	RSBI	Non RSBI**	RSBI + Non RSBI**
<b>5. Others</b>			
5.1. Minimum	0.00	0.00	0.00
5.2. Median	0.01	0.00	0.00
5.3. Maximum	0.80	3.61	3.61

\* Including allowances for extra tasks (head master, deputy head master, class head, etc)

\*\*Karawang was excluded from observations because of the prohibition on receiving funds from parents.

**Figure 3.2: Median of Percentage of School Non-Salary Operational Cost from Various Sources**



Schools obtain funds from parents in various ways. The most common way is through the entrance fee (which is paid when acceptance of a student in SMA is announced). Various terms are used for this entrance money: money for development; money for participation in education; and committee money (paid in a routine manner/monthly). Other levies applied in some schools include specific charges for additional lessons to prepare for the national examinations and charges for OSIS (the student council). These latter charges vary from school to school, but are usually around Rp 200,000 per year. "OSIS money" is not exclusively used for the activities of students and OSIS, but is part of the general school budget. Some schools also charge compulsory annual re-registration fees of around Rp 400,000 (for classes 11 and 12). Generally, district funding for state SMAs is focused on the payment of PNS salaries, while a little is allocated to the purchase of goods and services. There are exceptions to this rule. Some districts have allocated funds specifically for school operational costs (e.g. Educational Subsidy Funds in Karawang or "District BOMM" in East Sumba).

Central government plays a larger role in supporting school operations (outside salaries) than provincial governments. Special Assistance for Poor Students (BKMM funds) from the central government can help schools meet their operational needs, but the extent to which this happens depends on how the funds are distributed. Some schools distribute the scholarships, in which case some, but not all may return in the form of fees. Others hold on to the money and offer reduced fees. In this latter case the BKMM funds could be regarded as a part of the school's operational funding.

From the schools point of view, parental contributions are the most regular and useful source of funding. By contrast, funds from the government are often delayed and this was a common complaint in virtually every school in the sample. This is a major problem for schools that are not permitted to receive fee income (in the present study, those in Karawang District). One school stated that they even have to borrow money in order to cope with cash flow problems that result from delays in government disbursement.<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> There are two mechanisms that are usually used: (1) debts: the purchase of goods in stores but with "delayed payment" or (2) mortgaging of the BPKB (legal papers) of a vehicle, owned by the school or by a teacher personally.

## 3.3 Household Expenses

As already described, the greater part (around 80%) of school non-salary expenses comes from the parents/guardians of students. In addition to the direct costs paid to the school, households also bear the indirect costs of education.<sup>7</sup> This sub-section describes the type and size of educational costs paid by the household.

### 3.3.1 Data and Calculation Techniques

The information used in calculating educational costs expended by the household consists of data from the household survey conducted in 14 schools in eight districts in four provinces. The survey succeeded in collecting 1,350 household samples (N=1350) from around 1,500 take-home questionnaires, which were distributed to students selected at random in classes 10, 11 and 12. The analysis of data from these sources was broken down by type of school (*RSBI* or non-*RSBI*); the level of household welfare (based on income quintiles); the gender of the students; and the location of the school (district and province).

A total of 18 types of expenditure on education were included in the household questionnaire (see Table 3.5), but not every kind of expenditure applied in every case. Therefore, the number of observations for each variable (n) is not the same as that of the whole household survey sample (N=1350)<sup>8</sup>. The frequency of incurring expenses for the cost of a hostel (*asrama*), for example, was only 193 (from 1,350, or around 14%). On the other hand, the frequency of incurring costs in relation to the purchase of snacks is 93% (n=1251).

**Table 3.5: Categories of Direct and Indirect Costs in the Present Study**

No.	Direct Costs (for the School)	No.	Indirect Costs (Personal)
1	Building/Entrance Costs/initial registration	10	Stationery (books, pencils, pens, etc)
2	Re-registration	11	Snacks
3	SPP/committee/BP3	12	School and sports uniforms
4	Practical work/laboratory	13	Bag, shoes, socks etc
5	Extracurricular activities	14	Additional lessons/courses
6	School books/LKS	15	Supporting school material (photocopies etc)
7	Examinations	16	Donations for major days (religious)
8	Study Tour	17	Hostel
9	Transport	18	Class cash

Not all expenses cover the same time period. Some outgoings are incurred daily, others are termly or annual. In order that all costs could be added up on a common basis, expenditure was converted into monthly payments.

Once the monthly expenditure for each type of cost had been calculated averages were obtained by applying a common dominator (N=1350).<sup>9</sup> These averages for each kind of expense were added to obtain the average total cost paid by parents/guardians for their children's education in SMA every month.

### 3.3.2 Results


The results of calculations show that the average total household expenditure for SMA education is Rp 552,312 per month. Among the 17 kinds of costs paid out by households, expenditure on snacks for students is the biggest item (25%). The second biggest expense is SPP or "committee money" (18%), followed by transport (15%). Money for registration and books is 7% and 5% respectively (see Figure 3.3).

<sup>7</sup> If reference is made to Govt. Regulation 19/2005, indirect costs are here the same as personal costs, whereas direct costs can take the form of investment or operational costs in the school (depending on their use by the school).

<sup>8</sup> The number of observations for each expense can be seen in Annex.1.

<sup>9</sup> Average calculations for each variable can be seen in Annex 2

Figure 3.3: Contribution (%) by Type of Expense to Total Expenditure on Education



In addition to total expenditure on education by households, the present study also attempted to look at the difference between direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are defined as costs paid by parents/guardians to the school, while indirect costs are educational expenditure not paid to the school. This showed that indirect costs form a greater proportion of total educational costs at household level than direct costs (64% compared with 36%). The size of indirect costs is very largely due to the amount of household money spent on food and transport for the student to attend school.

The study then looked at the difference in educational costs paid by households with a child in an *RSBI* school and those with one in a non-*RSBI* school. From Table 3.6 it can be seen that the total expenditure paid by parents/guardians for *RSBI* schools is almost twice the amount spent on non-*RSBI* schools. Parents who educate their children at *RSBI* schools pay a higher proportion of direct costs by comparison with those whose children attend non-*RSBI* schools.

Table 3.6: Direct and Indirect Costs Identified in the Household Survey

Type of School	Direct Costs		Indirect Costs		Total Costs	
	Rp/month	%	Rp/month	%	Rp/month	%
<b>RSBI</b>	299,882	41	430,471	59	730,352	100
<b>Non-RSBI</b>	164,101	36	285,791	64	449,892	100
<b>RSBI + Non-RSBI</b>	213,686	39	338,626	61	552,312	100


### 3.3.3 Perceptions about costs

For most poor households the high costs of education greatly influence their decision to continue to enrol their children in secondary schools. The household survey indicates that of all the costs associated with education, tuition fees are considered to be the most burdensome for parents (see Figure 3.4).

The cost of tuition varies between schools and also regions. In regions where a “free school” policy operates, there are no tuition fees for students attending public *SMA*, except for those attending *SMA RSBI*. In regions where tuition fees are subsidised, they are typically around Rp10,000 per month. Elsewhere, tuition fees at the non-*RSBI SMA* surveyed were between Rp60,000 and Rp110,000 per month, whereas for *RSBI SMA* fees ranged between Rp150,000 and Rp250,000.

Although tuition fees at *RSBI SMA* are higher than non-*RSBI SMA*, figure 3.4 shows that the percentage of respondents who stated that the tuition fee was the most burdensome was higher among non-*RSBI* parents.

Figure 3.4: The cost considered most burdensome by households



After tuition fees, the next most burdensome cost is the re-registration fee and the entrance fee. The re-registration fee has to be paid by students when they continue from grade 10 to grade 11 or from grade 11 to grade 12. In this survey re-registration fees, which ranged between Rp500,000 and Rp1,350,000, were only charged in schools in Lampung Province. Schools claim that re-registration fees reduce the burden of initial entrance fees by spreading the costs over three years.<sup>10</sup> Entrance fees vary from place to place and in the survey ranged between Rp1.7 million to Rp3 million.<sup>11</sup>

Parents find these costs particularly burdensome, not only because of the amounts involved, but also because they are lump sum payments at the beginning of the academic year. Poor households reported going into debt to pay these fees.

<sup>10</sup> In NTT the re-registration fee also exists, however this fee is actually a three monthly tuition fee that has to be paid upfront by students before they start the new semester

<sup>11</sup> In *Kabupaten Karawang* the *pemda* [local regulation] applies a policy of “free school”, *RSBI* high schools are permitted to request school entrance fees.



The researchers also found evidence of *SMA* students themselves contributing to the costs of their education, using money that they earn from working. 18% of *SMA* students in the survey work outside of school hours. Several students used breaks between classes at school to sell mobile phone credit or assist at the school canteen. Table 3.7 shows that 40% of students from poor households were working compared to 12% of students from higher income households, indicating that the need to work is related to family circumstances. In NTT, a province with an above-average level of poverty, the percentage of *SMA* students working is higher than in the other provinces surveyed.

**Table 3.7: The Proportion of High School Students Working**

% Respondents	Working	Not working
<b>All Respondents</b>	18	82
<b>By Groups of income</b>		
Q1 (Quintile 1, the poorest)	40	16
Q2 (Quintile 2)	23	19
Q3 (Quintile 3)	12	21
Q4 (Quintile 4)	13	21
Q5 (Quintile 5, the richest)	12	22
<b>By Province (Study Locations)</b>		
Jawa Barat	21	79
Jawa Tengah	5	95
Lampung	17	83
Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT)	30	70

**Table 3.8: Characteristics of work types (% students working)**

Characteristics			
Type of work	%	Average time spent working per day	2-3 hours
Farmer/farm labourer	40	Receive a wage	57%
Retailing	32	Maximum wage (Rp/week)	180,000
Non-farm labourer	10	Minimum wage (Rp/week)	1,000
Ojek driver	8	Average wage (Rp/week)	54,026
Others	10		
Total	100		

Amongst the students who completed the take home survey of this Study, 246 (22%) were scholarship recipients, and the majority of these were recipients of scholarships especially for poor students (*BKMM*) funded by the central government.<sup>12</sup> Many of these students (38%) stated that the scholarships they receive are managed by their schools and are used to pay their tuition fees.

In addition to the take home survey for students currently studying at high school, this study conducted a small-scale survey (with 83 respondents), in Jawa Tengah and NTT, of students who graduated from junior high school (*SMP*) in 2011 but did not continue on to high school (either *SMA* or *SMK*).

Generally graduates of junior high school (*SMP*) not continuing on to *SMA* came from households that were poorer than the households of students currently attending high school (see Table 3.9). Nevertheless, this same table shows that there are also *SMP* graduates who did not continue to high school even though their parents/guardians were not poor.

<sup>12</sup> Generally students receiving scholarships do not know the source of the scholarship money that they receive. Some of the recipients known that their scholarship is from the government, but they are not sure if it is from the central, provincial or district government. Through interviews with the schools it is understood that most of the schools only receive *BKMM* from the central government.



**Table 3.9: Distribution SMA Students from Grade 10 and SMP Graduates who did not continue their education based on Household income level (% Respondents)**

Household Income group	Grade 10 SMA students	SMP graduates not continuing to SMA
Q1 (quintile 1, the poorest)	19	21
Q2	19	21
Q3	9	31
Q4	25	15
Q5 (quintile 5, the wealthiest)	28	13
<i>Total</i>	<i>100</i>	<i>100</i>

Results from interviews indicated that a large proportion of respondents (63%) did not continue to SMA because schooling is too expensive. Approximately 10% of respondents who did not continue to SMA said this was because they had to assist their parents to make a living. In NTT, cases were found, even though the proportion was relatively small, of female students who did not continue with their schooling because they had to marry. This shows that non-economic factors also prevent SMP graduates continuing with their education to SMA.

**Table 3.10: Reasons why SMP graduates have not continued to SMA**

Reason for not continuing	Per cent
Child has to work/help parents make a living	10
High cost of schooling	63
Distance from school is too far	2
Not accepted at a government or their choice of SMA	1
Sick/disabled	1
Child does not want to continue/is lazy/ social influence	18
Child has married	2
Parents/guardians need to school other children	1
Other reasons	1
Total (N=83)	100

## 4. Service Standards and Financing Implications

### 4.1 Service Standards for SMA

As no generally agreed minimum service standards exist for Senior Secondary Schools (SMA), those established for junior secondary schools were used as a basis for discussion and development.<sup>13</sup> The principle used in compiling the simple standard to be tested in the field was that for each indicator, the qualifications for SMA could not be lower than those for SMP (Junior Secondary).

The first draft was taken to schools to obtain feed-back about various indicators but the opportunity was taken to also measure schools against the standards. Table 4.1 below represents the result of the first draft consultation.

**Table 4.1: First Draft of Minimum Service Standards for SMA and a Comparison with those for SMP and MT**

No	SPM for SMP/MTs (Permendiknas 15/2010)	Tentative SPMs for SMAs
1	Availability of one classroom for one study group	Availability of one classroom for one study group
2	Availability of one IPA laboratory complete with table/chair and equipment for practical work	Availability of laboratories for Physics, Chemistry and Biology complete with tables/chairs and equipment for practical work
2a		Availability of a library
2b		Availability of computers in the school
3	Availability of one teacher for each subject	Availability of one teacher for every subject
4	70% of teachers have an S1 (or D4) degree and half of this 70% already have certification	All teachers have an S1 (or D4) degree and 50% have certification
5	Availability of teachers with certification for Mathematics, Science, Indonesian and English	Availability of one certified teacher for Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Indonesian and English
6	The head of the school has an S1 degree (or D4) as well as certification	The head of the school has an S2 degree as well as certification
7	Availability of text books for all subjects, with one book for each student	Availability of text books for all subjects, with one book for each student
8	Teachers work 37.5 hours a week	Teachers work 37.5 hours a week
9	Teachers follow the curriculum in teaching (KTSP)	Teachers follow the curriculum in teaching (KTSP)
10	Teachers prepare teaching plans (RPP)	Teachers prepare teaching plans (RPP)
11	Teachers make an evaluation of students' results	Teachers make an evaluation of students' results
12	The head master supervises classes at least twice a semester	The head master supervises classes at least twice a semester

<sup>13</sup> Permendiknas No. 15 of 2010 regulates Minimum Service Standards for junior school education, which takes in SDs/MIs and SMP/MTs. At the time when this report was prepared, there were no SPMs for SMAs.

No	SPM for SMP/MTs (Permendiknas 15/2010)	Tentative SPMs for SMAs
13	Teachers report evaluations of students to the head master at least once a semester	Teachers report evaluations of students to the head master at least once a semester
14	The head master reports students' progress in learning to parents at least once a semester	The head master reports students' progress in learning to parents at least once a semester
15	The school applies School Based Management (MBS)	The school applies School Based Management (MBS)

When assessing the schools visited for this study using the draft simplified service standards, the results were as follow in Table 4.2.

**Table 4.2: Achievements in the First Draft of Minimum Service Standards for SMAs in 9 Study Schools\***

No	Indicators	Level of Attainment (% of Schools)				
		Not yet achieved	Partly achieved	Almost achieved	Already achieved	Total
1	One classroom available for one study group	0.00	5.58	11.11	83.33	100.00
2	One laboratory available for each subject (Physics, Chemistry and Biology) complete with tables/ chairs and equipment for practical work	5.56	38.89	27.78	27.78	100.00
2a	Library available	27.78	-	-	72.22	100.00
2b	Computers available	16.67	-	-	83.33	100.00
3	One teacher for each subject	-	5.56	38.89	55.56	100.00
4	All teachers have an <i>S1</i> (or <i>D4</i> ) degree and half of them have certification	-	27.78	-	72.22	100.00
5	Availability of teachers with certification for Mathematics, Science, Indonesian and English	5.56	11.11	22.22	61.11	100.00
6	The head of the school has an <i>S2</i> degree as well as certification	44.44	-	-	55.56	100.00
7	Availability of text books for all subjects, with one book for each student	16.67	66.67	16.67	-	100.00
8	Teachers work 37.5 hours a week	11.11	5.56	11.11	72.22	100.00
9	Teachers follow the curriculum in teaching ( <i>KTSP</i> )	-	16.67	27.78	55.56	100.00
10	Teachers prepare teaching plans ( <i>RPP</i> )	-	-	11.11	88.89	100.00
11	Teachers make an evaluation of students' results	-	-	-	100.00	100.00
12	The head master supervises classes at least twice a semester	-	-	16.67	88.89	100.00
13	Teachers report evaluations of students to the head master at least once a semester	-	-	-	100.00	100.00
14	The head master reports students' progress in learning to parents at least once a semester	-	-	-	100.00	100.00
15	The school applies School Based Management ( <i>MBS</i> )	-	16.67	22.22	61.11	100.00

\*Including 2 private schools; 2 non-study *SMAN* added in evaluating (draft) *SPM* achievement

Table 4.2 reveals a number of points:

- No school (including *RSBI* schools) met the requirement of the availability of text books for all subjects, with one book for each student. Most schools regard the provision of text books as the responsibility of parents, not of the school. Unless this requirement is seen as a school responsibility, there is very little likelihood that this indicator in the draft *SPM* will be met.
- The availability of laboratories is also very low. Only 28% of schools surveyed met this requirement; most that did are *RSBI* schools or non-*RSBI* schools preparing to become *RSBI* schools.
- Schools performed very poorly against indicator No. 3 : 'one teacher for each subject'. Only 56 percent of sample schools met this requirement. This means that many teachers teach more than one subject. The same percentage occurred with indicator No. 9, that teachers follow the curriculum in teaching (the *KTSP*). This indicates that implementation of the *KTSP* in *SMA* still requires attention.

- Schools also performed very poorly against indicator No. 4, which requires all teachers to have an S-1 education and half of them to have certification. This can be explained by the large numbers of non-*PNS* teachers. Many *PNS* teachers do not have certification because they do not meet the minimum requirement of teaching for at least 24 hours per week. This may be an indication that the schools where they teach have too many teachers.

The first draft of the *SPM* for Senior Secondary Schools (*SMA*) was also discussed with educational stakeholders at central level and in the regions to obtain inputs. Several important inputs are noted below:

- Indicator No. 3, concerning the availability of laboratories: the need for small schools (with less than 200 students) to have one laboratory for each of these subjects (Physics, Chemistry and Biology) may be excessive.
- Indicator No. 6 concerning the need for the head of a school to have an S-2 degree: this requirement appears excessive and is beyond the official government stipulations. It is suggested that an S-1 degree is sufficient, with the additional requirement that such teachers must have already attended education or training to become a head master.
- Indicator No. 12 concerning supervision by the head master of classes: some explanation was sought about the type of supervision. If it means full supervision (the head master present in each classroom twice a semester), it would be very difficult to implement.

Based on the above inputs, a second Draft was prepared of the Minimum Service Standards for *SMA*, following further discussions with the Ministry of Education and Culture. Table 4.3 presents the Second Draft.<sup>14</sup>

**Table 4.3: Minimum Service Standards Proposed for *SMA***

No.	Indicators
1	One classroom available for one study group
2	One Science laboratory <b>that can be used</b> for Physics, Chemistry and Biology, complete with tables/chairs and equipment for practical work
3	A library that can be used as a learning resource
4	School computers available for use as learning resources and/or school management
5	One teacher available for each subject
6	All teachers to have an <i>S1</i> degree and half of them to have certification
7	One teacher with certification to be available for each of the following: Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, Biology, Indonesian, <b>Economics, Sociology, Geography</b> and English
8	The head master has an <b>S1 degree</b> as well as certification, and has received training to become the head of a school
9	Text books available for all subjects, with one book for each student
10	Teachers work 37.5 hours a week
11	Teachers follow the curriculum in teaching ( <i>KTSP</i> )
12	Teachers prepare teaching plans ( <i>RPP</i> )
13	Teachers make an evaluation of students' results
14	The head master supervises classes at least twice a semester
15	Teachers report evaluations of students to the headmaster at least once a semester
16	The head master reports students' progress in learning to parents at least once a semester
17	The school applies School Based Management ( <i>MBS</i> )

## 4.2 Financial Implications

Not all indicators in the (draft) *SPM* have implications for the financing of education. Indicators 10-17 can be met through policies and commitment at the school level, accompanied by a monitoring system and supervision by the relevant agency, without demanding a special allocation of funds. If funds are available,

<sup>14</sup> (Bolded items in Table 4.3 indicate changes following inputs were heard from various sources.)

they can be allocated in the form of training in the preparation of *KTSP* and *RPP* for teachers who have not yet received such training.

Several indicators related to the provision of infrastructure and facilities, such as Indicator No. 1 (sufficient classrooms), No. 2 (availability of laboratories), No. 3 (libraries) and No. 4 (availability of computers), have major cost implications. Schools that do not yet meet these indicators require significant funds for investment costs to provide these facilities together with the equipment that is needed so that everything can be used effectively in the learning-teaching process. In the specific case of a library, after a library has been built, the school must implement a learning process that involves use of the books in the library as a source of studies. If this is not done, the existence of a library will not help the learning-teaching process in the school.

The problem of the availability of teachers and certification (Indicators No. 5 and No. 6) could be solved if the Government can arrange the allocation of teachers in such a way that teachers employed in schools with too many teachers can be moved to schools with a shortage. Organising an equitable distribution of teachers is a major problem for the government.


The need for teachers with certification for a number of subjects that are included in the National Examinations (Indicator No. 7) cannot be met in the short term. The first step that has to be taken is collecting data concerning the availability of teachers with certification in all schools.

Indicator No. 8 (education and training for school heads) has implications for the appointment of new headmasters. It is not difficult for prospective head masters to meet educational requirements (an S1 degree) and the same applies to certification. However special training for prospective head teachers which is seen as part of the selection process has yet to be developed and this would require funding. The indicator that requires special attention is the availability of books (Indicator No. 9). A political decision is required to establish whether the purchase of essential textbooks is the responsibility of government or parents.

### 4.3 Responsibilities for Financing Senior Secondary Education

An explanation has already been given of the funding pattern that is found in State *SMA*. Figure 4.1 is an attempt to simplify and clarify “who could be responsible for what”. It does not represent a recommended pattern of financing, but is included in order to highlight some important issues.

Figure 4.1: Simplifying the sources of funding for State *SMAs*



This arrangement raises a number of important questions about the responsibilities of the various levels of government and the nature and magnitude of parental contributions. Government finances are not infinite and there are strong arguments in favour of user charges because the private returns to this level of education are high. On the other hand, in the interests of creating more equitable access to senior secondary education, there are equally strong arguments for reducing the cost burden for poor families and for selective government subsidies.

Figure 4.1 suggests that meeting investment costs in state schools is the responsibility of the central and provincial governments. Investments costs include the building of new school units, new classrooms, serious rehabilitation, the provision of educational infrastructure and facilities in schools, and the supply or other durable goods. If necessary, the private sector can be involved, as is happening currently.

One crucial point in the finance pattern recommended above is teacher salaries, in particular non-*PNS* teachers. District/city governments are responsible for the payment of the salaries of *PNS* teachers (as has been happening up until the present time), but a question remains over who should cover the salaries of non-*PNS* teachers. More efficient teacher deployment practices would sort out the poor distribution of teachers and obviate the need for schools to take on non-*PNS* teachers. However, rationalising teacher deployment is a major undertaking and is unlikely to be achieved in the short term.

The simplified model in Fig 4.1 retains some degree of parental responsibility for non-salary operational costs. Funds from parents are needed, especially in anticipation of cash flow problems for the school as a consequence of delays in the disbursement of government funds. The aspects that need attention are whether there should be government imposed ceilings on parental contributions and what measures are put in place to ensure that poor children can access senior secondary schools.

## 5. Initiatives to Increase Senior Secondary School Participation

Steps have already been taken by the different levels of government to increase school participation in senior secondary education.

### 5.1 Central Government Initiatives

The arrangement for the construction of new schools is that the *Kabupaten/Kota* are responsible for the provision of land, while the central government pays for the construction of buildings and the provision of equipment and infrastructure. For each new school, the government builds three classrooms, a library, a science laboratory (Physics, Chemistry and Biology) and a teachers' room. For existing schools, the central government also gives a block grant that can be used by the school for new classrooms (and also for equipment and infrastructure, books for the library, etc.) for the purpose of increasing the enrolment capacity of the school.

Field observations show that access to state secondary education is limited. Not all sub-districts have a State *SMA* (or *SMK*). As a result, some students have to travel long distances or live apart from their parents. This, for many, must be a disincentive to continuing their education.

In addition, the Government gives assistance in the form of *BOMM* funds (Operational Assistance for Management of Quality) to all *SMA* (including private *SMA*) to the value of Rp 90,000 per student per month. Those schools designated *RSBI* receive between Rp 100 million and Rp 300 million per annum as a subsidy towards meeting their operational costs. A minimum of 30 per cent of the funds received by *RSBI* schools should be allocated to poor children. In practice, some *RSBI*, particularly those in urban areas, have difficulty in allocating funds to poor students because they have too few poor students.

The Government assists poor families to educate their children at *SLTA* level through the Special Assistance for Poor Students (*BKMM*) with funds to the value of Rp 65,000 per student per month. The aim is to reduce the financial burden of schooling for poor households and encourage poorer students to continue in the education system. Generally, schools tend to retain *BKMM* funds to set against school fees, rather than give the money to the students and recoup what they can.

## 5.2 Provincial Government Initiatives

On the whole, provincial governments take few initiatives to increase participation in senior secondary schools. The general view in provincial government is that *SLTA* participation is the responsibility and of each *Kabupaten/Kota*. However, almost all provinces allocate funds to help *SMA* in the *RSBI* category, but this assistance is more of an encouragement to raise quality than an attempt to increase overall access. Several provinces allocate scholarship funds for poor students (not only for *RSBI* schools) and there are also provinces that give assistance to schools in the form of goods (books, study aids and the like). Generally, however, assistance of this kind has a limited impact on increased access or participation.

## 5.3 District Government Initiatives

Some districts have introduced initiatives to increase participation at the *SMA* level; others have not. One programme that has been developed is the “*Sekolah Filial*” (Filial School) programme (which in some regions is known as “*Kelas Jauh*”). The “*Sekolah Filial*” is a satellite of an existing *SMA* located elsewhere, usually in the grounds of a junior secondary school. In *Kabupaten Grobogan*, for example, *SMA* students attend school afternoon classes (because in the mornings classrooms are used by *SMP* students).

In 2009/10 there were 29,866 Junior Secondary Schools in Indonesia: over one and a half times more than the number of *SMA* and *SMK*, with greater coverage in more remote areas. In those places, filial schools would increase access for 16-18 year-olds in poor households. Teachers for the Filial Schools are usually the existing *SMP* teachers (but occasionally there are teachers seconded from the main *SMA*. Students in the Filial *SMA* take the National Examinations in the main (*induk*) school.

Filial Schools in *Kabupaten Karawang* are situated in State Elementary Schools (*SD Negeri*) but are under the coordination of a specific State *SMA* as the main school. The advantage of this model is that the schools are able to reach locations that are even further away than if they were placed in a State *SMP* (because there is at least one State *SD* in each village). This model, however, requires special arrangements for contract teachers (non-*PNS*) to teach in the Filial *SMA*, because *SD* teachers on the whole cannot be given the task of teaching in *SMA* classes.

Besides developing the Filial *SMA*, *Kabupaten Karawang*’s policy of “free schooling” means that State *SMAs* cannot seek or receive fees in any form from students. This does not apply to *RSBI* schools. In compensation, the *Kabupaten* allocates funds for the operational needs of State *SMA* (including *RSBI* schools<sup>15</sup>) based on the number of students. The allocation is Rp 55,000 per student per month.

This Karawang policy has had some mixed consequences:

- Participation in state schools has risen very rapidly (to the point where on average State *SMA*, with the exception of *RSBI* schools, has more than 1,200 students). However, participation in private *SMAs* has fallen sharply. The policy has therefore caused a shift from private to state schools, rather than a dramatic increase in overall participation.<sup>16</sup>
- The provision of infrastructure and operational funds has not kept pace with rise in the number of students. There are concerns that the double shift system is affecting quality, because student’s time on task has been reduced and extra-curricula activities have been foregone.
- The policy that prevented schools from collecting funds from students has created a problem of *cash flow* for schools because funds from the regional government are always late.

<sup>15</sup> With the existence of these funds, the *RSBI SMA* in Karawang collect a smaller fee (Rp 95,000 per student per month).

<sup>16</sup> At the time when the present study was carried out, the local regional government was preparing plans to give help with operational funds to private *SMAs* (and not only State *SMAs*).



*Kabupaten* East Sumba (Nusa Tenggara Timur) has a policy whereby the local government gives “District *BOMM*” funds worth around Rp 60,000 per student per month,<sup>17</sup> but still allows State *SMA* to collect fees from students in limited amounts. (“Committee money” in one school in East Sumba in this study was only Rp 10,000 per student per month). Under a policy of this kind, the school obtains sufficient funds from the government but does not experience cash flow problems because there are still funds from students and parents, even though the value is not very great.

## 5.4 School Initiatives

Several *RSBI* schools have taken the initiative of increasing the number of scholarship recipients in various ways. *SMAN* 1 Purbalingga, for example, made an internal arrangement that students who do not receive *BKMM* could nevertheless receive a reduction in costs.<sup>18</sup> This includes orphans and children of one-parent families, those who become officials of OSIS and those who perform well academically. In the 2011/212 school year, from a total of 1,047 students in the school, 301 (29%) paid reduced school fees.

<sup>17</sup> This means that with the addition of Central *BOMM* funds of Rp 90, 000 per student per month, schools would receive *BOMM* funds totalling Rp 150,000 per student per month for operational needs.

<sup>18</sup> *BKMM* can only be given if the student provides a Statement of Poverty (*SKM*) from the local village (*kelurahan*). Students whose parents are public servants (*PNS*) or members of the Army/Police cannot receive *BKMM*, even though the parents may have the lowest rank.

## 6. Policy Options for Expansion of Senior Secondary Education

This section of the report discusses some policy options that could be adopted by the government to support the expansion of senior secondary education envisaged in the education sector plan.

No single policy or intervention will be sufficient to reach the objective of increased access. The preferred mix of policies and programmes will be determined by political and macro-economic factors beyond the scope of this exercise. However, policy makers need a better picture of what the options are, how effective different measures are likely to be and what they will cost.

National Statistical data indicate that in 2011 the 16-18 year old population was 12.40 million. It is projected to be 12.14 million by 2014. By this date, on current projections and without further interventions, there will be 10.32 million students in senior secondary education. In order to achieve the target of 85% GER by 2014 an additional 256,600 students will need to be enrolled, on top of the projected "natural" increase. The question is: how can this be achieved?

**Table 6.1: Enrolments in SMA, SMK and MA 2003/04-2009/10**

	2003/04	2004/05	2005/06	2006/07	2007/08	2008/09	2009/10
<b>SMA (N+S)</b>	3.257.973	3402615	3.497.420	3.574.146	3.758.893	3.857.245	3.942.776
<b>SMK (N+S)</b>	2.141.574	2164068	2.231.927	2.401.732	2.738.962	3.095.704	3.319.068
<b>MA (N+S)</b>	n.a	n.a	777.627	817.920	855.553	895.834	917.227
<b>Total SLTA</b>			6.506.974	6.793.798	7.353.408	7.848.783	8.179.071

Source: *Pusat Statistik Pendidikan* (Ministry of Education and Culture) and *Statistik Indonesia* (Central Body of Statistics) Supply-Side Polices

While the objective is an expansion of access to senior secondary education, serious consideration also needs to be given to the effects of expansion on education quality. As has been seen throughout the world, the rapid expansion of primary education in order to meet Education for All goals and MDGs has brought unwanted consequences for educational outcomes. Similar problems could ensue in attempting to cater for the bulge of demand created by the successful expansion of primary and junior secondary education. Moreover, simply increasing financing to senior secondary education may not necessarily result in improved educational outcomes. What is required is targeted policies and practices that fit together to form a comprehensive whole.

It would be a mistake to focus exclusively on the financing requirements of the additional school capacity needed to increase enrolments without also considering the existing provision, which is itself below optimum levels. The costs of expansion are not confined to marginal costs. The quality of the existing system also needs to improve, so that there are more, better trained, certified teachers, more learning materials and books and greater opportunities for learning, such as through use of ICT and practical work in science subjects. The system at its present enrolment level, before any expansion takes place, needs more financial support than it currently receives.

It is important to note that the senior secondary education system is built on the premise that students requiring practical and vocational skills will gravitate to technical and vocational schools (*SMK*) and *SMA*s are a primarily preparation for higher education. However, over 40% of the *SMA* student respondents in this study reported that they intend to seek work directly after graduating, rather than go on to higher education. The fundamental assumptions that underlie the system may need to be addressed as the secondary sub-sector expands. Those students who do continue in the education system to higher studies require improved problem-solving and study skills. These considerations imply a continuing need to improve the quality and relevance of senior secondary curricula as the system expands.

## 6.1 Provision of Infrastructure

The construction of new school units would immediately increase the capacity of educational facilities to accommodate more students. However, in order to provide sufficient places to increase enrolment to the 85% target, it has been estimated that 2,100 schools will have to be built in the next two years.<sup>19</sup> The cost of building and equipping these schools would be in the region of Rp 3.7 trillion.<sup>20</sup> When the recurrent costs of staffing these new schools are factored in, the government would have to find an additional Rp 900 billion each year.<sup>21</sup>

Not only are the costs prohibitive, but the time required to build, staff and establish new schools would pose considerable challenges, given the policy objective of rapid expansion. Urgent work would have to be done on the appropriate siting of new schools to ensure that they were built in the areas of greatest need. The whole process of land acquisition, procurement of contractors and construction, not to mention the deployment of staff and the identification of prospective students takes considerable time. Experience in Indonesia suggests that at least two years are needed from the start of construction for a new school to be ready to accommodate students.

An increase in the capacity of the senior secondary school system can also be achieved through the expansion of existing schools by building new classrooms. Providing additional classrooms, however, is also costs prohibitive. Moreover, it cannot solve the problem of access for students who live far away from existing schools.

## 6.2 Provision of Operational Funds for *SMA*s (the *BOS* Model)

The Ministry of Education and Culture has announced an extension of *Bantuan Operasi Sekolah* (*BOS*) to senior secondary schools in 2013. Through this programme the government will channel funds for the operational needs of *SMA*s (both state and private) and thereby hold down the costs charged to parents. Such a scheme has operated for primary and junior secondary schools for some years.

The results of the household survey in this study show that charges paid directly to the school (for entrance money/money for buildings, re-registration charges and monthly fees) are the costs that parents regard as the most burdensome. The provision of *BOS* could reduce this burden on parents and provide an incentive to sending their children to school. Estimates made by this study of the operational funds needed in State *SMA*s are around Rp 1,100, 000 per student per year. If the *BOS* funds for *SMA*s were to cover the whole of this amount and the number of *SMA* students (state and private) in 2013 is around 4.85 million, the cost of the *BOS* scheme for *SMA* would be around Rp 5.4 trillion in that fiscal year alone.

19 This figure is based on the assumption that a new school consists of three classrooms, one laboratory, and one library and there is an average of 120 students per school.

20 Based on information obtained from the Directorate for Guidance of Senior High Schools, the estimated cost of building one new school unit/*Unit Sekolah Baru/USB* (3 classrooms, 1 office, 1 teachers room, 1 *IPA* laboratory, 1 library, toilet and furniture/equipment) is Rp 1,775,000,000. For the present time, the factor of inflation is not included in estimates.

21 Assuming a staffing complement per school of 18 persons (15 teachers, 3 educational staff) and that salaries (and allowances) average Rp 2 million per month.

The availability of funds is not the only challenge to the *BOS SMA* programme. A greater challenge is the extent to which the impact of this policy will be felt in terms of growth in enrolment. The provision of block grants to schools is a blunt instrument for increasing participation, particularly when access is limited by the number of student places in senior secondary schools. In order for there to be a positive and significant impact on enrolment, the *BOS* policy for *SMA*s must be accompanied by other policies to create greater senior secondary school capacity.

### 6.3 Increasing Efficiency

There is considerable scope for expanding senior secondary education through containing and reducing unit costs and by a more efficient use of resources. In common with many other countries, Indonesia has inefficiencies in its education system. Better utilisation of existing resources could reduce the per-pupil costs to the government.

Unit costs could be reduced, by better utilization of teachers so that they spend more of their time in contact with students and by reducing teacher absenteeism. This indicates the need for better incentives and monitoring mechanisms to improve the efficiency of the existing workforce and for tackling the almost universal practice of “moonlighting”, by which teachers often have more than one job. While the student-teacher ratio is low (13.5:1) in Indonesia, compared to other countries, teacher absenteeism and the high number of part-time teachers result in class sizes being much greater than the student-teacher ratio suggests. Reducing avoidable costs requires a greater level of cost consciousness than currently exists in most schools. More efficient teacher deployment, although an essential policy component, is not a short-term fix. Relocating teachers is notoriously difficult to implement.

However, there will be scope in some places for increasing the size of classes. Some schools already operate a double-shift system with morning and afternoon classes. This is a viable short-term solution, but it is not a popular option, because double shifts are associated with reduced teacher-student contact time and the loss of extra-curricula activities. There is a popular perception that this leads to lower learning outcomes, but properly managed, such a system could expand access and improve efficiency. Moreover, some form of shift working in populous areas may be unavoidable if the enrolment targets are to be met.

#### Box 6.1 Supporting High Levels of Secondary Enrolment in Urban Areas: the case of China

China has managed to support high levels of secondary enrolment in urban areas at low cost through a combination of relatively low salary costs, high additional school income through revenue-raising, work-unit subsidies and fee-paying students from outlying areas. This has been further assisted by low population growth. The longstanding structural features of education finance in China are uncommon elsewhere. Schools and their teachers have a wide range of economic and social responsibilities. It is not uncommon to find local taxation for education placed on businesses. In addition to this, schools assets have been put to entrepreneurial use and schools have generated work-unit related income (a share of whose profits they keep) from activities unrelated to schooling. In addition to this, some schools have been able to generate substantial income from students residing in outlying areas. However, there have been consequential impacts on equity and a growing problem of inadequate supply of competent teachers in areas where salaries cannot be enhanced.

Source: Lewin and Caillods (2001), *Financing Secondary Education in Developing Countries*, IIEP.

**Box 6.2 Making Better Use of Teachers to Increase Efficiency: Kenya**

A 2004 World Bank study projected that it would be possible to increase secondary enrolments (grade 9-12) by 50% without increasing the number of teachers by:

- Increasing official teaching load from 18 to 25 hours a week;
- Using part time teachers for subjects that are taught only a few periods a week;
- Increasing class sizes from an average 36 to about 45;
- Expanding existing schools to at least three parallel streams;
- Sharing teachers across schools
- Establishing a minimum class size for optional subjects;
- Establishing a minimum cut-off level for the teaching load of each teacher;
- Limiting the time allocated to administrative duties

Source: Rajkumar, and Onsomu (2004)

The development of filial schools, which this study encountered in Karawang and Grobogan, is an extension of the idea of double shifting. A “filial school” is a school which is administratively a part of a “mother school” (*sekolah induk*), but whose teaching-learning activities are carried out remotely. This is a relatively inexpensive way of increasing senior secondary enrolments using existing resources more intensively and avoiding large expenditure on new infrastructure.

In the model operating in Grobogan, teaching-learning activities in an *SMA* filial school are carried out in a local State *SMP* closer to the students. Most of the teachers in this model are teachers in the *SMP* where the filial school is located. This has the advantage of providing senior secondary schooling too hard to reach students and is popular with teachers, particularly those at the *SMP*, whose second job does not now require travelling between locations. The additional hours they work also gives them the additional teaching hours that they need to obtain certification.<sup>22</sup> Teaching in a filial school takes place in the afternoon after the lessons are finished in the *SMP*.

Filial schools in Karawang are located in a State Primary Schools.<sup>23</sup> This means that schools can reach prospective students in the remotest locations, but the challenges are also greater. Most of the teachers have to be drafted in and as a result, the majority of *SMA* filial teachers are non-*PNS* teachers who have been specially recruited by the district government. This makes this a more expensive model than that operating in Grobogan.

The filial school model represents part of a possible short-term solution to increasing capacity. There are clearly possibilities for variations on this theme. The idea of developing larger schools with satellite smaller schools sharing facilities such as laboratories, computer rooms and libraries recognises that large schools have lower unit costs when facilities are shared by a large number of students and can offer a wider variety of subject options. It allows more students to study a broader curriculum than they would be able to do in smaller schools. However, it brings with it problems of establishing and maintaining quality. Moreover the legal status of satellite schools needs to be clarified, before this idea can be rolled out extensively. From discussions in *MOEC* with the *Direktorat Pembinaan SMA*, there appears to be some uncertainty about whether such arrangements are permitted under current regulations.

Technological advances permit consideration of a far wider range of approaches to the expansion of secondary education than was possible only a few years ago. The use of distance learning through the internet, broadcasting, and combinations of video-conferencing and face-to face instruction are now within the realms of practicability and affordability. Examples of technology-enhanced learning can be seen in Mexico’s *Telesecundaria*, Brazil’s *Proformacao*, India’s National High School and South Korea’s Air Correspondence High School. Indonesia has a long and relatively successful track record in providing junior secondary school tuition through open learning (*SMP Terbuka*) and although this was primarily

<sup>22</sup> For certification a teacher is obliged to teach a minimum of 24 hours per week. In many schools it is not easy for teachers to meet this condition.

<sup>23</sup> In Karawang, this model is not referred to by the term “Filial School”. Instead, the term “Distance Class” is used. In essence it is the same as a filial school because there is a State *SMA* that constitutes the “mother” school.

aimed at providing basic education to hard-to-reach youth, the modalities for extending access to senior secondary education could be similar.

### Box 6.3 Alternative Education in Mexico

Mexico has made dramatic progress in secondary school enrolment in recent years. This was partly due to the introduction of timely policies and programs. Mexico first introduced supply-side policies followed by demand-side policies and more recently the latter have had an equity focus. The country has increased resources through the federalisation of primary and secondary education. Programs such as the *Telesecundaria* program (distance secondary learning) and *Oportunidades* (CCTs for poor families) have also been deemed successful in promoting secondary education in the country.

### Educational television for secondary education

*Telesecundaria* is a satellite television-based program in Mexico that offers secondary education as part of the national system. It provides a complete package of support to teachers and students in remote rural areas. Instruction is delivered through broadcasts, teachers and text. Almost 800,000 students are currently enrolled in the program. Costs are comparable to those of conventional schools in more populated urban areas. To be eligible for participation communities need 15 primary school completers and a place to study. The government provides a teacher, a satellite dish, wiring, the instructional program and textbooks. Several other countries in the region have adapted the programs, using video instead of satellite broadcasts.

Source: Murphy et al 2002<sup>24</sup>

## 6.4 Engaging with the Private Sector

Indonesia has an established tradition of private education provision and the sector includes a range of institutions: elite schools; religiously affiliated schools; and low-cost private schools. This tradition stems in part from the relationship between the government and Islamic schools. Many Islamic senior secondary schools (MA) cater predominantly for the poor.

The established status of private education means that there is a ready-made physical and institutional infrastructure for increasing the involvement of the private sector in plans for expansion. Private institutions and contributions from households can be useful vehicles for mobilising resources and for providing and maintaining stable service delivery of secondary education. Research evidence suggests that private school students tend to perform better and at lower unit costs. This is believed to be due to a combination of factors including greater wage efficiency in private schools, higher levels of teacher accountability and increased competition and accountability to parents.

Strong public-private partnerships have several key characteristics. There needs to be a positive attitude in government towards private provision. This needs to be supported by a clear regulatory framework, based on expected minimum standards. Regulations need to be permissive of variation, rather than directive. The tax regime needs to be conducive to business and tolerant of profit, rather than punitive.

All such partnerships rely, to some extent on public funding, either in the form of subsidies and grants, vouchers or the provision of teachers. They need therefore to reflect government concerns and support government policies.

<sup>24</sup> Murphy, P., Anzalone, S., Bosch, A. and Moulton, J. (2002), 'Enhancing Learning Opportunities in Africa: Distance Education and Information and Communication Technologies for Learning', African Region Human Development Working Paper Series, World Bank.

**Box 6.4 Public Private Partnership (PPP) in Pakistan and the Philippines**

The Punjab Education Foundation (PEF) has been the main vehicle of PPPs in Punjab province, Pakistan, and has had a number of initiatives including Foundation Assisted Schools Program (FAS), the Continuous Professional Development Programme (CPDP) and the Education Voucher Scheme (EVS) among others. FAS is a voucher scheme funding private schools on a per-pupil basis based on certain eligibility criteria. The schools are usually low cost with a fee ceiling. In addition to per pupil funding, school and teacher performance rewards have been introduced. On the demand side, PEF has also introduced a voucher scheme in which parents are given a voucher for their child to attend a high-fee charging private school for free. The vouchers have been allocated based on household SES, household size and occupation of the household head.

An example of a successful PPP initiative can be found in the Philippines. Through the Education Service Contracting Program (ESC), the government entered into contracts with private schools to enrol students in areas where there was a shortage of public high-school places. Subsidies under the ESC were generally restricted to students at schools charging low fees with preference being given to students from low-income families. Since 2003, the number of ESC grantees has grown at an average annual rate of 12 per cent and in 2009 nearly half of all private secondary schools in the Philippines had ESC grantees enrolled in their schools. There were almost half a million ESC-grantees in 2009 as compared to 4000 in 1987.

However, structures of private-public partnerships need to ensure that government aided private schools i.e. those that are publicly funded and privately managed retain the advantages of private schools rather than becoming de-facto government schools.<sup>25</sup> Unlike India where aided schools are de-facto government schools, Bangladesh has seen more success in this regard. Whilst overall school quality in Bangladesh is low, students in publicly-aided Madrasahs and private-aided schools outperform students in government schools.<sup>26</sup>

## 6.5 Provision of Teaching and Learning Materials

The results of the school survey showed that none of the schools that were visited provided learning materials or textbooks that can be borrowed by students. At lower levels of the education system Minimum Service Standards (SPM) for SDs, MIs, SMPs and MTs include the obligation of schools to supply textbooks at a ratio of one book per student for all school subjects. If Minimum Service Standards for SMAs and MAs are to be adopted, it would be appropriate for the same stipulations about textbooks to apply. Thus every SMA should provide textbooks in the proportion of one book for one student for all subjects. This strategy would however be very expensive. By way of illustration, if in 2013, the number of students in State SMAs will be 4.8 million, the number of SMA subjects is 15 and that the average price of a book is Rp 40,000, the funds needed to provide books in State SMAs would be around Rp 1.92 trillion in that fiscal year.

## 6.6 Financial Assistance to Poor Students

Pro-poor policies based on cash transfers or scholarships, if well targeted, can be appropriate financing options for senior secondary education. Loans are generally regarded as more relevant financing options for tertiary rather than secondary education, but there have been innovative schemes such as Income Contingent Loans (ICLs) that have been used successfully in some countries. Experience has shown them to have lower default rates whilst at the same time promoting both equity and efficiency. However, because of the complexities in administration, these schemes have been used more in the developed world, such as in New Zealand and the UK. Loan arrangements would be complicated in a country as large and diverse as Indonesia.

25 Kingdon, G. (1996), 'The Quality and Efficiency of Private and Public Education: A Case Study of Urban India', Oxford Bulletin of Economics and Statistics, 58 (1): 57-82.

26 Chaudhry, N. and Asadullah, N. (2009), 'Reverse Gender Gap in Schooling in Bangladesh: Insights from Urban and Rural Households', Journal of Development Studies, 45:8, 1360-1380.



From 1999-2004 Indonesia had a ground-breaking cash transfer scheme, the Scholarships and Grants Program (SGP).<sup>27</sup> This attempted to help students meet the financial burden of schooling and compensate them for the opportunity costs of forgone earnings. Its primary aim was to retain children in school, rather than increase enrolments and it has been criticised for not affecting long-term learning outcomes at secondary levels, which was not its main objective. A more pertinent criticism was that it was not targeted with sufficient accuracy at poor students and the use of school committees in identifying recipients was not universally successful.<sup>28</sup> However, it demonstrated that a very large scale cash transfer scheme could be put into operation on a national basis and provided the basis of the scheme that still operates today.

Policies that integrate financial incentives with the provision of information and mentoring support have been successful in other countries. The Aim Higher Program (UK) and the Philadelphia Futures Sponsor-A-Scholar Program use a combination of academic support, mentoring as well as financial support and have been found to have positive effects on both upper secondary test scores as well as progression to tertiary education. These results are particularly significant for at-risk students.

Another innovative financing option used by several developing countries in recent years is the use of Individual Learning Accounts (ILAs). These have the dual target of encouraging individuals to save for education whilst simultaneously providing vouchers for their education. Examples of this include Brazilian Graduation Incentive which formed part of the *Bolsa Escola* program and the *Oportunidades* program in Mexico which provided scholarships to students to remain in school as well as save credits which are then deposited in their savings accounts which can be used to finance further education. Evaluation of the *Oportunidades* program in Mexico has shown significant positive effects among secondary school populations in terms of attendance, transition and other outcomes, particularly among girls. Mexico's *PROGRESA/Oportunidades* program has shown a successful example of how to manage this transition process.

#### Box 6.5 Conditional Cash Transfers in Mexico

The conditional cash transfer program, *Oportunidades*, was a cross-sectoral funding scheme that offered cash stipends to households conditional on school attendance. *Oportunidades* is funded mainly by the resources freed by the reduction in the blanket food subsidies popularly known as the "tortilla subsidies." The scholarships are also adjusted to cover the opportunity cost of attending schooling and although initially started for primary schools in rural areas the program now also covers secondary schools and urban areas also. The program has been linked to improvements in secondary school enrolment. One of the reasons for the success of this program is the adoption of demand-side subsidies with cross-sectoral funding. The World Bank has stated that this Program exploits synergies between education, health, nutrition, and monetary transfers in the production of human capital, offering beneficiaries a long-term chance to escape chronic (intergenerational) poverty. This has supported greater educational access for poor and rural families.

When effectively targeted, CCTs can be effective means of improving the educational outcomes of specific groups. For example, a scholarship programme introduced in Cambodia to improve the transition of girls between primary and secondary schooling has shown significant positive results of 30 percentage points improvement in enrolment and attendance among recipients in programme schools. In particular, girls from low socio-economic-status households were the major beneficiaries.<sup>29</sup> Lessons from the Primary Education Stipend Programme in Bangladesh tell us that in order to be effective, these schemes need to be well targeted and linked to inflation. Researchers examining the distribution of scholarships in India have noted similar weaknesses in targeting. Children in the lowest wealth quintile children (the preferred recipients in a redistribution program) received the lowest share of scholarships.

<sup>27</sup> The SGP was the prototype for the later *BKMM*, which is continuing today.

<sup>28</sup> Ridao-Cano, C., and D. Filmer. (2004), 'Indonesia: Evaluating the Performance of SGP and SIGP: A Review of the Existing Literature and Beyond', EAP Region Working Paper No. 2004-3, Human Development Sector Unit, World Bank, Washington, DC.

<sup>29</sup> Filmer, D. and Schady, N. (2008), 'Getting Girls into School: Evidence from a Scholarship Program in Cambodia', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 56(3), pp. 581-617



Voucher schemes have received a good deal of attention as means of increasing enrolments amongst the poor and promoting equity in access to services (ref. box 6.6). They are also credited with addressing school quality issues by introducing an element of competition in the school choice decision.

#### Box 6.6 School Vouchers in Colombia

Colombia's *PACES* program, a targeted pro-poor voucher scheme, has been shown to have positive impacts on students.<sup>30</sup> Within this scheme, the cost of the voucher was split 80/20 between the central and municipal government. Initially, students applied according to certain eligibility criteria and over-subscription was dealt with through a lottery scheme. Vouchers were reviewed annually and eligibility was dependent on student outcomes. Vouchers allowed students to attend private schools and covered up to 90 per cent of the cost of the direct costs of schooling. Lessons learned from the experience of this scheme included the need to link payments to inflation, ensuring that higher cost and better quality schools did not drop out of the system.

## 6.7 Next Step: Financing Scenarios

The original intention of this study was to construct a series of financing scenarios that would demonstrate the effects of various policy options. However, this was not possible during the assignment.

It is therefore suggested that a key follow up would be to take this work further and construct a series of financial models which would use current data from the education management information system together with known and projected costs, in order to simulate the effects of the various options and the consequences of varying the policy mix. Medium term financing scenarios could be developed to 2019 (to incorporate the next Government planning cycle).

Simulation models are available that will list the variables and show the effects of changing the inputs. These financial models will not themselves provide all the answers, but they will help to inform policy-making by basing decisions and choices on evidence and reasonable assumptions on the likely effects of various policy measures.

## Appendix A.

# Study Research Methodology

### Interviews with Provincial and District Education Offices

At the Education Office, the study team had discussions with the officer in charge of high school matters. Information collected at this level covered secondary data on the supply of schools and teachers, budget allocations for *SMA*, as well as the levels of participation for each of the stages of *SMA*. Discussions with the Education Department were also conducted to determine the schools to be visited in the school survey.

In addition, at the *Kabupaten* level, the Study Team held focus group discussions involving Education Office staff, school superintendents, and school principals as well as teaching staff to discuss the draft Basic Service Standards.

### Schools Surveys

At the school-level, the Team conducted interviews with school principals (or their deputies) and several teachers. The purpose of this was to obtain information on school budgets, the numbers of students, the supply and quality of teachers and the relevance of the draft service standards prepared by the research team. The questionnaires and assessment of the Service Standard are included in Appendix 2 to this Report.

### Household surveys

Household surveys conducted in this Study used two methods – a take-home survey and a survey completed by an enumerator on a home visit. Household respondents were parents/guardians and/or *SMA* students as well as graduates of junior high school (*SMP*) who did not continue to *SLTA*.

The take-home survey was employed in order to reach more households than could be achieved using a “home visits” methodology on its own. Students participating in the take home method were given a questionnaire, followed by an explanation of the importance of the survey, instructions as to how to fill out the questionnaire and an explanation of the need to discuss the answers with their parents. Once returned the following day, the team checked each answer to ensure that all questions had been answered correctly. The questionnaires used in the take home survey contained a majority of closed questions (response options were provided). Questions on the questionnaire (see Appendix 2) consisted of information on students and household characteristics (name, age, gender, occupation of parents), the welfare status of the family (income and assets), access to schools, the amount of parental expense on high school education (direct and indirect), information about scholarships being received, the status of working children and the aspirations of students after they graduate from high school.

In addition to the take-home survey, the Study also conducted site visits to the homes of students. These home visits aimed at interviewing junior high school graduates who graduated in 2011 but did not continue on to high school. These students were identified in several ways, primarily by questioning grade 10 students at the closest *SMP* to the *SMA* visited, if they had friends at *SMP* who did not continue, and then by using the “snowballing” method, which involved asking the initial respondent for the name and address of the next respondent.

The visit to homes survey used a questionnaire with similar items to the “take home” survey. In these questionnaires there were no questions about the cost of education paid by parents but there were additional questions on the reasons why their children did not continue to *SLTA*, the current activities of their children, as well as the type of government assistance most needed so that their child could continue to *SLTA*.

## The Location and Study Sample

The choice of location and study sample was carried out in stages. The first stage was the selection of a province with the criteria of having an average poverty rate greater than the national average (13.7%). After selecting the province, the selection of the *Kabupaten* within the chosen province was done using a criterion of poverty and the Gross Enrolment Rate (GER).

**Table A.1: Selection stages of the location and study respondents**

Selection stage	Reason / Selection criteria
Province	Above the average national poverty rate (>13.7%)
<i>Kabupaten</i>	Poverty and Gross Enrolment Rates (GER)
School	In each <i>Kabupaten</i> two schools were selected. The first school was <i>RSBI</i> (if one existed). The second school had average quality, was located in the <i>Kabupaten</i> centre but not too far from the centre, and on advice from the Education Office.
Student/ Household	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>For the take home survey: Students selected randomly from grades 10, 11 and 12 with proportional amounts of girls and boys and between the study majors of Science (<i>IPA</i>), Humanities (<i>IPS</i>) and Languages (few <i>SMA</i> offer this major).</li> <li>For visiting the homes of <i>SMP</i> graduates who did not continue studying, the sample selection was based on information from the <i>SMP</i> and the “snow-balling” technique.</li> </ol>

Before carrying out the field study, the Study team conducted trials to gauge the suitability of questions, the effectiveness of delivery of the take home survey as well as the availability of data at the school level (especially budget-related information). The trials were conducted at one *SMAN (RSBI)* in Central Jakarta and at one *SMAN (non-RSBI)* in *Kabupaten Bogor*. A number of changes were made to the research instruments as a result of the trials.

The field study implementation successfully visited eight *Kabupaten* in four provinces and in each *Kabupaten*, the team visited two to three schools, one of which was *SMAN RSBI* (unless in the area there was no high school in the *RSBI* category). In total, the Study team collected information on 17 high schools, five of which were *SMAN RSBI*. Table 2.3 below details the visits.

The household survey study team distributed “take home” surveys in 15 high schools visited. In each of these high schools the team distributed approximately 100 questionnaires to students of grades 10, 11 and 12 using purposive random sampling based on gender, class and economic background. The questionnaire return rate was about 85 percent and 1350 household questionnaires were processed.

Household visits to obtain information from junior high school graduates who did not go on to high school were conducted in two provinces, Jawa Tengah and Nusa Tenggara Timur. The survey was not conducted in other provinces due to limited time and resources. In both provinces, the team collected information from 83 households. The household survey was limited to children who graduated from junior high school in 2011 with the aim of meeting children and households who were until recently connected with high school, and so the information was comparable with current Grade 10 *SMA* students.

Table A.2: *Kabupaten*, Schools and Households Visited/Surveyed

Province	<i>Kabupaten</i>	School	RSBI	Household/Student
<b>Test trials</b>				
DKI Jakarta	Kota Central Jakarta	SMAN 68	Yes	100 take home
Jawa Barat	Kabupaten Bogor	SMAN 1 Cibinong		Nil
<b>Field Study</b>				
<b>Jawa Tengah</b>	Purbalingga	SMAN 1 Purbalingga	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 1 Bukateja		100 take home 20 Household visits
	Grobogan	SMAN 1 Purwodadi	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 1 Toroh		100 take home 20 Household visits
<b>Lampung</b>	Lampung Tengah	SMAN 1 Kota Gajah	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 1 Gunung Singgih		100 take home
	Pesawaran	SMAN 1 Gedong Tataan	*	100 take home
		SMAN 2 Padang Cermin		100 take home
<b>Nusa Tenggara Timur (NTT)</b>	Kota Kupang	SMAN 3 Kupang**	Yes	120 take home
	Timor Tengah Selatan (TTS)	SMAN 1 Molo Selatan		120 take home 20 Household visits
		SMAN 1 Soe		Not carried out #
	Sumba Timur	SMAN 1 Waingapu	*	60 take home 20 Household visits
		SMAN 1 Haharu		60 take home
<b>Jawa Barat</b>	Karawang	SMAN 1 Karawang	Yes	100 take home
		SMAN 4 Karawang		Not carried out
		SMAN 1 Teluk Jambe		100 take home
		SMAS Korpri		100 take home

\* SMAN 1 Waingapu and SMAN 1 Gedong Tataan are "Model Schools" and have sought to become RSBI schools. \*\* SMAN 3 in Kota Kupang was included as the only RSBI school in NTT Province.

# No students in school on the day of the site visit (Saturday).

## Appendix B.

# School and Household Survey Instruments

### QUESTIONNAIRES FOR SCHOOLS

Date of interview : \_/ \_/ \_

Time : .....

Interviewer : .....



1. Name of respondent : .....

2. Position of respondent : .....

3. Name of school : .....

4. Public or private? : 1. Public 2. Private

5. Status of school : 1. RSBI 2. Seeded School/SKM 3. Other

6. Monthly tuition fee : .....

7. School development/investment fee: .....

**A. NUMBER OF STUDENTS AND TEACHERS**

1. Number of students by gender and grade:

Grade	Female	Male	Female+ Male
10			
11			
12			
All grades			

2. Number of students with tuition fee waived or discount: .....

3. Number of students receiving other financial assistance: .....

4. Number of classes (rombongan belajar) : .....

5. Number of classrooms : .....

6. Number of teachers by gender, status, education and certification:

Gender	Status		Education			Certification	
	PNS	Non PNS	< S1	S1	S2/S3	Certified	Non Certified
Female							
Male							
Female+Male							

7. Number of supporting staff (non teacher) by gender and status:

Gender	PNS	Non PNS	Total
Female			
Male			
Female+Male			

**B. SCHOOL REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE**

1. Please may I have a copy of this school's budget?

(Note: The DETAILED Budget NOT the Budget Summary)

2. In the last academic year, did school receive in-kind contribution from the government or elsewhere?

1. Yes

2. No

3. If school received, please mention what kind of goods and the value (amount)?

4. Are there any school revenues not shown in the school budget/report?

If any, please indicate the source/s and amounts:

5. Are there any other expenses not shown in the school report/budget?

If any, please indicate the amount and use of the funds:

**C. PERCEPTION ON THE SUFFICIENCY AND NECESSITY**

1. Is there any activity/program that is currently NOT funded by the school budget but you think that is necessary, or should not a priority? If any, please mention:

**D. ASSESSMENT ON ACHIEVMENT OF SIMPLIFIED SERVICE STANDARDS**

(Please fill attached form based on school data, observation or interview with the head master)

INSTRUMENT FOR ASSESSMENT ON ACHIEVEMENT OF SIMPLE SERVICE STANDARDS AT SCHOOLS

No	Simple Service Standards for SMA	Achievement				Cost estimate of meeting the standard		Who should pay?	Notes
		Below	Partially	Almost	Meets the standard	Investment	Operational		
1	One classroom for one class (learning group)								
2	One complete lab of each for Chemistry, Physics and Biology								
2b	Library is available								
2c	Computers are available at school								
3	One teacher for each subject matter								
4	100% teachers are S1 graduates and half of them are certified								
5	One certified teacher is available for Math, Chemistry, Physics, Biology, Indonesian Language and English								
6	Head teacher should be S2 graduate and certified								
7	Text books are available for all subject matter, one book for one student								
8	Teachers' working hours are 37.5								No implication to cost
9	Teachers use/apply school level curricula (KTSP)								No implication to cost
10	Teachers prepare teaching plan (RPP)								No implication to cost
11	Teachers conduct evaluation on students' performance								No implication to cost
12	Head teacher supervise teaching/learning in classes at least twice in one semester								No implication to cost
13	Teachers report results of evaluation to head teacher at least one per semester								No implication to cost
14	Head teacher reports results of evaluation to parents once per semester								No implication to cost
15	School implements SBM								

## HOUSEHOLD SURVEY ON EDUCATION EXPENDITURE

This survey aimed at collecting information on household education expenditure. The result of this survey will be utilized as input for decision makers in Education. We request that students answer all the questions honestly.

We thank you for your participation in this survey.

### Instructions in Answering the Questions

Please read the instructions before answering the questions:

1. Students have to discuss all answers with parents/guardians
2. Write the answers on the right side columns
3. Your household/family means the house where your parents/guardian live at present
4. If your answer is not one of any available options, please choose other answer and explain what is your answer.
5. After all the questions have been answered, please have a parent/guardian sign the front page.

Q1. Name of student	
Q2. Sex	1. Female    2. Male
Q3. Age of student	
Q4. Grade	
Q5. Major (Grade 11 and 12 only)	1 Natural Science (IPA)    2 Social Science (IPS)    3 Language (BHS)
Q6. School name	
Q. 7 District	
Q.8 Province	

Date.....

Signature

Parents/Guardian



## A. Household Economic Condition

<b>A.1. Where are you living now?</b> 1. With parents 2. With relatives 3. In a dormitory 4. Rent a room/house 5. others, explain _____	_____
<b>A.2. If you are not living with your parents, please explain why.</b>	_____
<b>A.3. How old is your father?</b> (leave blank if your father already passed away)	_____ year
<b>A.4. How old is your mother?</b> (leave blank if your mother already passed away)	_____ year
<b>A.5. What is your father's highest education?</b> 1=No schooling (illiterate) 2=Did not finished SD/MI 3=Graduated SD/MI 4=Did not finished SMP/MTs 5=Graduated SMP/MTs 6=Did not Graduate SMA/SMK/MA 7= Graduated SMA/SMK/STW/MA 8=Diploma 9= University Graduate (S1) 10=Master/Doctor (S2/S3) 11=Others, explain _____	_____
<b>A.6. What is your mother's highest education?</b> 1=No schooling (illiterate) 2=Did not finished SD/MI 3=Graduated SD/MI 4=Did not finished SMP/MTs 5=Graduated SMP/MTs 6=Did not Graduate SMA/SMK/MA 7= Graduated SMA/SMK/STW/MA 8=Diploma 9= University Graduate (S1) 10=Master/Doctor (S2/S3) 11=Others, explain _____	_____
<b>A.7. What is the main occupation of your father?</b> 1= Farmer (own land) 2= Farm laborer 3= Fisherman 4=Farmer (livestock) 5= Non-farm laborer 6= Entrepreneur (self employed) 7= Private employee 8=Civil servant/police/military 9=Professional (e.g. doctor, lawyer) 10= other services (driver, motorcycle taxi) 11= Retired 12=unemployed 13=house husband 14= Others, explain _____	_____

<b>A.8. What is the main occupation of your mother?</b> 1= Farmer (own land) 2= Farm laborer 3= Fisherman 4= Farmer (livestock) 5= Non-farm laborer 6= Entrepreneur (self employed) 7= Private employee 8= Civil servant/police/military 9= Professional (e.g. doctor, lawyer) 10= other services (driver, motorcycle taxi) 11= Retired 12= unemployed 13= house wife 14= Others, explain _____	_____ person _____ person _____ person
<b>A.9. Number of household members</b>	_____
<b>A.10. Number of household members age between 7-18 year?</b>	_____
<b>A.11. Number of household members currently enrolled in SD/MI, SMP/MTS, SMA/SMK/MA</b>	_____
<b>A.12. What is the main source of lighting in your house?</b> 1= electricity from PLN ; 2= Electricity non-PLN 3= Kerosene lamp; 3= Others, explain _____	_____
<b>A.13. What is the type of ownership of your family's house?</b> 1= Own the house 3= Official house 5= Inheritance not yet divided 2= Rent a house 4= Shared house 6= Others, explain _____	_____
<b>A.14. Does your household own these assets?</b>	Number of units _____ Unit
i. Car	_____ Unit
ii. Motor Boat/fishing boat	_____ Unit
iii. Motor bike	_____ Unit
iv. Color TV	_____ Unit
v. Refrigerator	_____ Unit
vi. Gas Stove	_____ Unit
vii. Washing machine	_____ Unit
viii. Land line telephone	_____ Unit
ix. Personal Computer/Lap Top	_____ Unit
x. Mobile Phone	_____ Unit

Does your household receive any income from the following sources?

Sumber pendapatan	Amount of income	1. daily	2. weekly	3. monthly
B.1. Waiver/honorarium	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.2. Selling of agricultural products/livestock/fishing	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.3. Income from business (shops, etc.)	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.4. Renting out assets	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.5. Interest from savings	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.6. Remittance from family members living outside the house	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.7. Pensions	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.8. Government assistance	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly
B.9. Others, explain _____	Rp _____ →	1. daily 4. quarterly	2. weekly 5. Every semester	3. monthly 6. yearly

#### REASON FOR CHOOSING SCHOOL

<p>C.1. What is the main reason you chose the SMA in which you are currently enrolled?</p> <p>1= distance (near home) 2=school fee 3=public transport 4=favourite school 5=Good quality 6= Parents' decision 7= the availability of dormitory 8= The availability of scholarship 9= Was not accepted by other schools 10= other, explain _____</p>	_____
--	-------

#### ACCESS TO SCHOOL

D.1. What is the distance from your current dwelling place to your school?	_____ kilometer	TT. Don't know
D.2. How long does it take (one way)?	_____ minutes	TT. Don't know
<p>D.3. What is the mode of transport that you frequently use to go to school?</p> <p>1=walking 2=motorcycle/taxi 3=public transport/bus 4= Boat (without motor) 5=Motor Boat/Pershu motor tempal/kapel motor 6=Private motorbike 7=Private car 8= School bus 9= Bicycle 10=others, explain _____</p>	_____	
D.4. What is the transport cost to go to and return from school (in a day)	Rp _____	TT. Don't know

## E. Below we would like to ask about education expenses paid by you/your parents

Type of Expenses	Amount	Frequency of Spending (Please circle the number)
E1. Registration fee	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E1A Re-register fee (when moving to the next grade)	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E2. Tuition/Committee fee	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E3. Laboratory fee	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E4. Extracurricular (art, sport, boyscout)	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E5. Class petty cash	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E6. Examination fee	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E7. Text Books/exercise books	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E8. Study tour	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E9. Courses provided by school or private	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E10. Photocopying	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E11. Stationary (books, pens, etc)	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once
E12. An Internet fee	Rp. _____ ↑	1. Daily    2. weekly    3. Monthly    4. Quarterly 5. A semester    6. Yearly    7. Once

Type of Expenses	Amount	Frequency of Spending (Please circle the number)
E13. Transport cost	Rp. _____	1. Daily 2. weekly 3. Monthly 4. Quarterly 5. A semester 6. Yearly 7. Once
E14. Pocket money	Rp. _____	1. Daily 2. weekly 3. Monthly 4. Quarterly 5. A semester 6. Yearly 7. Once
E15. School uniform	Rp. _____	1. Daily 2. weekly 3. Monthly 4. Quarterly 5. A semester 6. Yearly 7. Once
E16. Bag, shoes, sock etc	Rp. _____	1. Daily 2. weekly 3. Monthly 4. Quarterly 5. A semester 6. Yearly 7. Once
E17. Cost of dormitory/rent a room	Rp. _____	1. Daily 2. weekly 3. Monthly 4. Quarterly 5. A semester 6. Yearly 7. Once
E18. Charity fee (religious festivals etc)	Rp. _____	1. Daily 2. weekly 3. Monthly 4. Quarterly 5. A semester 6. Yearly 7. Once
E19. Other Expenses, explain _____	Rp. _____	1. Daily 2. weekly 3. Monthly 4. Quarterly 5. A semester 6. Yearly 7. Once

E20. What is the most burdensome school fee mentioned for you or your parents?

E20.a Please give the reasons

#### F. SCHOLARSHIP

<p>F.1 Do you currently receive a scholarship? 1=Yes 2=No → Please go to question G 8= Don't know → Please go to question G</p>	_____
<p>F.2. What is the source of your scholarship? 1=Government 4=Private 8=Don't know 2.=Foundation 5=Individual 3=School 6=Others , explain _____</p>	_____
<p>F3. Why were you chosen as a scholarship beneficiary? 1= From poor household 3=Other reason, explain _____ 2= Good school performance</p>	_____

6

<b>F.4. When did you first receive the scholarship?</b>	Year _____ Month _____
<b>F.5 How much did you receive?</b>	Rp _____ 1= monthly 2= A semester 3=Yearly TT=Don't know
<b>F.6. Who manages the scholarship money?</b> 1= Myself 2= Parents/guardian 3= Some parents, some myself 4= Teachers/head teacher 5= Other, explain _____	_____
<b>F.7 For what did you use the money ?</b> 1= Tuition fee 2= Books/school stationary 3= Uniform/shoes/bagu 4= Transport fee 5= Pocket money 6= Daily needs (Food etc) 7= to be saved 8= Other, explain _____	_____
<b>F.8 If you did not receive the scholarship, would you be able to remain in school?</b> 1= There is a possibility that I will drop out 2= yes, I will keep continue my study 3= Don't know	_____

**G. SCHOOL FEE REDUCTION**

<b>G.1 Do you at present receive school fee reduction</b> 1= Yes 2= No → Please go to question H 8= Don't know → Please go to question H	_____
<b>G.2 What is the amount of reduction</b>	Rp _____
<b>G.3. When did you first receive the reduction in school fee?</b>	Year _____ Month _____

**H CHILDREN WORKING TO EARN MONEY**

<b>H.1 Besides study, do you also work to earn money, including helping your parents/business?</b> 1= Yes 2= No → Please go to I	_____
<b>H.2 What type of job do you do?</b> 1= Farmer/farm laborer 2= Casual job (non-agricultural) 3= work in a factory 4= Motorcycle taxi 5= Trader 6= Other, explain _____	_____
<b>H.3 On average, how many hours in a day you do your job?</b>	_____ hours

H.4 Do you receive any payment for the job you perform? 1. Yes    2. No → Please go to I	
H.5 What is the average payment you receive?	Rp _____ 1. A day    2. A week    3. A month
H.6 Who manages the money received? 1=All held by parents    3. Some by parents some by student 2=All held by student    4. Other, explain _____	_____
H.7 How was the earned money used? 1= Tuition fee    5=Pocket money 2=Books/school stationery    6= Daily needs (Food etc) 3=Uniform/shoes/bag    7=to be saved 4= Transport fee    8=Other, explain _____	_____

#### I. Undertaking domestic work

I.1 How many hours during a day do you help your parents/guardian in performing domestic work? (include fetching water, cleaning the house, cooking, doing laundry, minding younger siblings)	_____ Hours
I.2 Is there any domestic aide employed in your house? 1= Yes    2= No	_____

#### J. Student's Aspiration

J.1 What is Your plan upon graduating from SMA? 1=Continue to the university    4=Working, then continue to the university 2=Find a job    5=Other, explain _____ 3=Getting married    6=I am unlikely to be able to finish SMA 7=Don't know	_____
--	-------

-----Terima kasih atas Bantuan Anda-----

## Photo Credit

Cover	From top left clockwise
	All photos are courtesy of MoEC Public Relations and Information Center
Back Cover	From top left clockwise
	Courtesy of kioslaris.wordpress.com
	Courtesy of www.123rf.com
	Courtesy of hjf-ringani.blogspot.com
	Courtesy of hjf-ringani.blogspot.com
	Courtesy of budaya-indonesia.org
	Courtesy of toko-berkat.blogspot.com





